


DEMOCRACY ALIVE

A selection from Recent Speeches

by

THE RT. HON. SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS, K.C., M.P.



SIDGWICK & JACKSON LTD.

1946

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

2019-2020

B-514
C-300A

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1946

MADE AND PRINTED BY GALE AND POLDEN, LIMITED, IDEAL HOUSE,
ARGYLL STREET, LONDON, W.1, at their WELLINGTON PRESS, ALDERSHOT

CONTENTS

I. *Shall the Spell be Broken?* PAGE 1

Rectorial Address to the University of Aberdeen,
6th February, 1943.

II. *The Election* PAGE 15

(a) Why is an Election Necessary? Widnes, 6th May,
1945.

(b) Economics is Not Enough. *Picture Post*, June,
1945.

(c) What is Our Problem? *Sunday Pictorial*, June,
1945.

(d) The Century of the Common Man. B.B.C.
Broadcast, 20th June, 1945.

III. *The Task Ahead* PAGE 39

(a) The Employers. Manchester Chamber of Com-
merce, 16th November, 1945.

(b) The Unions (Lancashire and Cheshire T.C.),
Blackpool, 9th September, 1945.

(c) Working Parties, House of Commons, 15th
October, 1945.

(d) The Location of Industry. National Union of
Manufacturers, 15th November, 1945.

CONTENTS

IV. *The Team* PAGE 69

- (a) The Government Service. To the Staff of the Board of Trade, 29th August, 1945.
- (b) The Research Worker. Physical Society, 1st January, 1946.
- (c) The Artist and Craftsman. The Association of Master Craftsmen, 26th November, 1945.
- (d) The Industrial Designer. The Society of Industrial Artists, 11th December, 1945.

V. *The Home and the Family* PAGE 91

- (a) Women and the Home. International Housing Exhibition. Gloucester Cathedral, 28th July, 1945.
- (b) The Family. To the Marriage Guidance Council, 5th February, 1946.

VI. *International Affairs* PAGE 105

- (a) Save the Children. Bristol, 19th January, 1946.
- (b) Youth in the Post-War World. Albert Hall World Youth Congress, 29th October, 1945.
- (c) On India. Edinburgh, 14th June, 1945.
- (d) The Commonwealth and Empire. Teachers' Conference at Bristol, 9th August, 1943.
- (e) Atomic Power and International Relations. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 29th September, 1945.

INTRODUCTION

AT THE REQUEST of many of Sir Stafford Cripps's friends I obtained his permission to bring into book form some of the many speeches which he has made during and since the war.

An earlier book *TOWARDS A CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY** was published, concentrating upon the Christian background which he believes to be an essential element to any true democratic progress.

It is with the background of that deep faith in the Christian teaching that the present collection of speeches must be read.


I have made no attempt to build up a complete picture of the political theory and action in which he believes, but I have rather selected a number of statements which disclose his faith in the democratic method and the needs of a living and progressive democracy.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that democracy, as we in Great Britain and the British Commonwealth and Empire understand it, is to-day on trial for its life. It is therefore of the utmost importance that we should realise how to think and act for its preservation. Democracy is no static form of political and economic organisation; if ever it should lose its dynamism it would most certainly be condemned to extinction. We must, I am convinced, study the methods by which we can by constant improvement and advance create that true and live democracy which can inspire the people of the world to a deep interest in their own future. It is only by entraining the peoples of the world in the art and practice of their own Government that we shall arrive at the peace and security which we all desire but which hitherto we have so signally failed to achieve.

It is because Sir Stafford Cripps has so profound a belief in such a virile and active democracy that I believe that his statements brought together in this volume may be of assistance to many who are searching for the same end that he has in view.

ALAN JARVIS

* *Allen & Unwin*, 1945.



I.

SHALL THE SPELL BE BROKEN?

RECTORIAL ADDRESS

*to the University of Aberdeen, delivered on
6th February, 1943*

AT THE BEGINNING of the fourth year of the greatest war in history you have done me, a lawyer and a politician, the signal honour of electing me as the Rector of your University. Not only have you chosen a man from outside the fighting services to follow the distinguished Welsh Admiral, who has so fitly represented you in the past, but you have chosen an Englishman, surely a good omen for that broader international outlook which we all hope to see after the war.

In trying to assess your reasons, and therefore my responsibilities upon this occasion, it has occurred to me that some of my often expressed views as to the future of our civilisation may have weighed with you in your selection of myself. I propose therefore, to devote this, my rectorial address, to some examination of certain lessons of the past which may, I hope, have a bearing upon your and my actions in the future.

I have noticed recently with some distress a growing tendency in our country to view the future with a certain degree of hopelessness and almost of sour disillusion.

The confident expectation which has been expressed very widely over the last three years that we should never return again to pre-war conditions, and that there would be fundamental change and marked progress, shows signs of weakening, just at the moment when the prospect of the war ending begins to materialise.

Doubts are creeping in, and signs are not wanting that privilege and selfish interests are busily preparing to cast the

future in the mould of the past. Nor does this development in our political trends seem to bring any sharp reaction from those who were formerly so confident of future change.

Indeed it is almost commonplace in these days to hear the most confirmed advocates of change expressing the view that "They" will never really implement the promise of a new Britain or a new world.

Who are these mysterious people referred to as "They," who are apparently looked upon as the veriest broken reed of a hope for the future ? "They" is not the language of democracy, or even of the class-struggle ! "They" is the language of dictatorship and defeatism of the common people.

We must put aside all such subservience within our democracy and speak instead of what "We" want and we will do, or insist upon being done. But in order that "We" may be effective to make "Them" do what we wish, we must understand not only the problems of the future but also the lessons of the past.

This is not, alas, the first great war that the world has witnessed, nor is it even the first war with a revolutionary character. Indeed, so far in our history, the inflexibility of our social structure, both nationally and internationally, has been so great that it has shown itself incapable of a sufficiently rapid adaptation to changing circumstances. We have thus been unable to obviate the exercise of violence in bringing about fundamental change.

In this sense, as all great wars are in fact dynamic movements of social and economic progression or retrogression, and since they are characterised by the exercise of force, they may truly be regarded as revolutionary.

During these periods of revolutionary struggle in the past, we have seen the urgent desire for change emerging during the course of the war, and we have witnessed what has become of it after the war has ceased.

A study of this cycle of events in former wars may give us the clue to what we must do in the final stages of this war, if we would see the hopes of change engendered by our common misfortunes transformed into realities of progress to the benefit of the masses of the common people of the world.

SHALL THE SPELL BE BROKEN ?

We must not be deluded by the professions of those who have much to lose by way of possessions or privilege. There is an old saying, full of wisdom, which is apposite, "The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be . . ."

Apparent agreement in the hour of peril when the whole man and woman-power of a country is essential for its very salvation, does not at all necessarily imply that there will be that same agreement when the time of peril is past.

Let us then turn back the pages of history to learn, if we can, the lesson of how we should act now if we would realise a truly progressive peace.

One of our most brilliant British authors has given us a name by which to designate this breaking down of the universal comradeship of war into the struggle for sectional advantage in the peace. Mr. Winston Churchill called it after the last war the "Broken Spell."

The political reaction of peace has almost always been marked by a relapse from the idealism of common effort, engendered by the stress of war, to a renewal of the internal struggle between progress on the one hand and reaction on the other.

The danger of defeat and the compulsion of war once removed, the old differences between the classes or sections of the community have come back to destroy the unity of purpose of the people.

Let me summarise this danger in the warning words of one of our young war poets, Jock Curle :

"And we would hope that something should be altered

In the cruel careless fundamental law,

But we must beware or the moment will escape us ;

It has done so before.

And we must see that out of the practical slaughter

Rise no mere vapoury dreams,

But a world where the poor are fed, the tyrants humbled,

And men know what life means."

The spell has been broken in the past partly because the spell itself was so potent. The very horrors of war themselves create the need for some compensating idealism, some

hopefulness to offset the bitter destruction of young life. Rather than overwhelm our minds with the blood and sweat and toil of the present we escape into the dreamland of the future and there are few who, in the hour of urgent danger, can be found to dash our hopes to the ground. Those who desire and work for great changes are inspired to press forward, while even those who would resist feel compelled to pay lip-service to the dreams of progress.

So it was that during the last war distinguished leaders added the weight of their advocacy to the common feeling for the need for fundamental change. In September 1914, Mr. Lloyd George spoke these words in the Queen's Hall in London:

"The people will gain more by this struggle in all lands than they comprehend at the present moment. It is true they will be free of the greatest menace to their freedom. That is not all. There is something infinitely greater and more enduring which is emerging already out of this great conflict, a new patriotism, richer, nobler, and more exalted than the old. I see amongst all classes, high and low, shedding themselves of selfishness, a new recognition that the honour of the country does not depend merely on the maintenance of its glory in the stricken field, but also in protecting its homes from distress. It is bringing a new outlook for all classes. The great flood of luxury and sloth which had submerged the land is receding, and a new Britain is appearing."

This was at the very outset of the war, but as time passed and the dangers grew more intense and with them the need for a greater and greater effort by the people, the spell became even deeper. It reached its climax just after the Armistice of 1918 in a speech that has often since been bitterly remembered. On November 25th, 1918, at Wolverhampton, our then Prime Minister drew this brilliant picture of the dreamland:

"The country realises in a way it never did before how much it owes to the citizens who dwell in its humblest homes. . . . Had it not been for these millions of men, who came from humble homes to lay their lives on the altar of their country, the British Empire might have been swept away, and at this moment we might have been cowering—cowering at the feet of the most arrogant masters that ever bullied the world. . . . What is our

SHALL THE SPELL BE BROKEN ?

task ? To make Britain a fit country for heroes to live in. . . . There is no time to lose. I want to take advantage of the new spirit."

What Mr. Lloyd George failed to see was that the opportunity had already been lost, the time had already passed, and the new spirit of common sacrifice was already at that very moment being strangled by the old forces of internal difference which rapidly reared their heads once the danger was past.

President Wilson in America was stressing the same need for a fresh start. In January, 1918, he had already announced that "the day of conquest and aggrandisement is gone by." Later in the same year he made his contribution to the spell, speaking in London :

"I believe that men are beginning to see, not perhaps the golden age, but an age which, at any rate, is brightening from decade to decade, and will lead us some time to an elevation from which we can see the things for which the heart of mankind is longing."

On the morning of the Armistice he thus summed up the situation :

"Everything for which America fought has been accomplished. It will now be our fortunate duty to assist by example, by sober friendly counsel, and by material aid to the establishment of just democracy throughout the world."

These were not in any sense the words of hypocrisy, but represented a genuine idealism which failed to appreciate the strength of those reactionary forces which had, for a time, been stilled by the agonies of war. The warning voice of Senator Lodge was soon heard expressing the view of reactionary isolationism. "We would not have our country's vigour exhausted or her moral force abated by everlasting muddling and meddling in every quarrel great and small which afflicts the world."

Before we come to any assessment of how far, if at all, the dreams of progress were realised either in our own country, or abroad, it is instructive to examine the very different circumstances of the Napoleonic Wars.

The French Revolution had stirred every autocrat and every ruling class in Europe with the fear of what might befall

them. The Napoleonic victories had looked like carrying the teachings of that revolution throughout Europe. H. A. L. Fisher, in his history of Europe, thus summarises the views of the conquerors in 1815: "They came to a common resolve that there must be no more French Revolution and that every germ of liberal opinion must be promptly killed lest it might develop into the malignant revolutionary fever." There might indeed have been a different outlook and a different sequel had Stalin filled the place of Tsar Alexander at the Congress of Vienna!

But even in those days of comparative unenlightenment of the common people, it was necessary to cast the spell. Von Gentz, the Secretary of the Congress of Vienna, tells us, "the grand phrases of 'reconstruction of the Social order,' 'regeneration of the political system of Europe,' 'a lasting peace founded upon a just division of strength' were uttered to tranquillise the people. The real purpose of the Congress was to divide among the conquerors the spoils taken from the vanquished."

Metternich once wrote that the happiest result was that there was to be no change in the existing order of things, though in this relation we must not forget his own private views of what that order was. "I came into the world," he says, "too late. I feel good for nothing. Earlier I should have had my share of the pleasures of the period! Later I would have helped in reconstruction. Now I pass my life in propping up worm-eaten buildings!"

It was the object of the Congress of Vienna to prop up those worm-eaten buildings, and yet because of the power of the French Revolution, although it had apparently suffered defeat, they could not arrest progress altogether.

Neither in Europe nor in England itself were the hopes of the reactionaries realised. For a few years it looked as if progress would be held down by repressive measures. The *Annual Register* of 1816, tells us, somewhat naively, "that the first year after the restoration of general peace should have been characterised in this country, as that of a more widely extended distress than its annals can for a long period exhibit, must doubtless have occasioned as much surprise as disappointment."

SHALL THE SPELL BE BROKEN ?

The attempt to give new life to the old system broke down. As a prominent historian has stated :

"There had been too much bloodshed, too many new ideas, too many exhibitions of the inefficiency of the old system, for it ever to return. The French revolutionary programme, the abolition of feudalism, equality before the law and Napoleon's appeal to nationality remained permanent factors of the new world which had arisen."

In our own country, where for years the leaders had been obsessed by the spectre of a triumph of the Jacobin principles, Castlereagh for a time deferred to Eldon's desire to enjoy the blessings of the old order and of peace, and little advance was made during the first years after the war had ended. But by 1832 the old traditions and institutions had been criticised, shaken and remoulded, and a profound constitutional change was accomplished in the teeth of the remonstrances of those who still clung to the principles of the old order. These changes were in part the outcome of European events, but even more the results of the industrial revolution.

We thus see that the immediate political consequences of the peace of 1815 were the triumph of reaction in the name of peace and order. To quote once more from the *Annual Register* : "It must be culpable discontent to be insensible of the meliorated condition of our country, when nothing is probably wanting to restore the enjoyment of the advantages so largely bestowed upon it except patience, prudence and economy."

But this triumph of reaction was short-lived, for the forces making for progress, especially those arising out of the industrial revolution, were too strong to be permanently held back.

In passing from the Napoleonic wars and their sequel and coming to more recent times it is significant that in these present years of strife, as indeed during and after the last war, Abraham Lincoln has been one of the most admired and often-quoted figures of history.

He spoke with the voice of the idealist in the American war of North and South. Let me quote from his second inaugural address :

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firm-

ness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

The history of the following years shows how far short the result fell of the hope. Reconstruction became a word hateful to the South. Progress was hindered by the reaction of a small group of men eager for money and power and unscrupulous of the rights of their fellow-citizens.

The bitterness of the Civil War was carried through into the peace, and the hopes of the people and the soldiers for that better and more just society pictured by Lincoln were disappointed.

And yet here again despite all the forces of reaction and bitterness something real and vital came out of the war.

The disunity of the war threw down a challenge to American statesmanship to knit the nation more closely together. The national character was deepened and became more mature. The foundations were indeed laid for the United States of America that is now our ally.

Let me now return to the war of 1914-18 and the uneasy peace which followed. I have already described to you the spell of hope that was cast upon the people ; let me now give you, in Mr. Winston Churchill's words, the opportunity which offered to the statesmen :

"On that November evening the three men at the head of Great Britain, the United States and France seemed to be masters of the world. . . . There was nothing wise, right and necessary which they could not in unity agree . . . (but) jealousies, factions, revenges long pent up now advanced on every side . . . A vast fatigue dominated collective action."

In the United States, war weariness, a renewed suspicion of Europe, a sense of disillusionment and party bitterness soon engulfed the whole country.

Mr. Lloyd George's assertion on the day after the Armistice in an address to his Liberal colleagues that the peace must be based on the fundamental principles of righteousness without base, sordid, squalid ideas of vengeance or avarice, was

SHALL THE SPELL BE BROKEN ?

overridden by the telegram from 370 members of the new Parliament which stated :

"Our constituents have always expected, and still expect, that the first action of the peace delegates would be, as you repeatedly stated in your election speeches, to present the bill in full, to make Germany acknowledge the debt and then to discuss ways and means of obtaining payment."

The old plea for peace and inaction was heard again. "We have been moved already beyond endurance and need rest," wrote a distinguished Britisher.

Tranquillity was the slogan with which Mr. Bonar Law won the 1922 Election, and President Harding echoed the same sentiment in his Presidential election campaign on the other side of the Atlantic : "America's present need is not heroics, but healing ; not nostrums, but normalcy ; not revolution, but restoration." And now we have learnt to what a pass rest, healing, normalcy and restoration have brought the world in twenty short years.

But although a great opportunity was missed, though the spell was broken and shattered, it would be a mistake to overlook the fact that there have been some items on the credit side, items that would never have been there but for the war.

A great nation was reborn in Russia and another in China. There was an enormous acceleration in scientific advance. The social tempo was quickened. In our own country a great advance was made in education, in the administration of health services, in the care of the unemployed, and the women of our country gained their emancipation. New experiments in international administration were attempted, and advances were made in Colonial and Indian administration.

But all these items added up were not sufficient to offset the losses or to pay for that world of hope which had been pictured to us during the war.

Before many months, "discontent and disillusionment were rife and we settled down once again to the class struggle, to the wavering and uncertain foreign policy which was the external manifestation of our internal doubts and hesitations, until at last we found ourselves swept, unprepared, into a new and greater world war.

We now approach once again one of those critical periods of hope which occur in every great war, as the prospect of ultimate victory begins to loom on the horizon.

The emotions of the people are hypersensitive, they are possessed of a great longing that something better and happier shall emerge from the horrors of war, that the price of suffering which the world is paying shall secure some fundamental and dramatic change in the lot of the common man and woman.

So men and women have wished and hoped in the past, but very largely those hopes have miscarried and those wishes have not materialised. You who stand now at the threshold of your lives will of necessity have a large part to play in the progress of our country in the coming years. And I would beg of you to observe objectively the problem with which you and your generation are faced.

Do not allow others to lead you astray by facile explanations dealing with the deceitfulness of politicians or the trickery of the ruling class. The problem is not so simple as that.

Many of those who cast the spell in former times were absolutely sincere in their hopes and desires, but, at the critical moment when they sought to implement those desires in action, the opposing forces were too strong.

This, I believe, was for two main reasons. The progressive forces failed to strike while the iron was hot. The time to get agreement on post-war plans is during the war when the atmosphere of co-operation is strong. To wait until hostilities have ceased, till the binding force of the common danger is no longer present, is to miss the chance of common agreement. And, second, they under-estimated the support they would win from the people—the common men and women of the country—for a bold programme of change. This support was neither clamant nor well defined in its objectives. There was a real sense of past wrongs and an urgent desire to see them righted, but how this was to be done remained shrouded in the fog of uncertainty.

There were too many voices crying out the specifics which would cure the disease, like the rival hucksters at a country fair. Progressive leadership suffered, as it always suffers, from its diversity. Each section and group was more devoted to its

SHALL THE SPELL BE BROKEN?

own particular nostrum than to the cause of progress as a whole.

It was vital that all the progressive forces should come together on a common platform to defeat reaction, but their ideological differences prevented them from securing common action. They under-estimated too—until it was too late—the strength of the opposition they would meet. The fact that such opposition goes underground while the war is in progress is apt to lead to the belief that it has disappeared altogether. It was not, I believe, that the spell-binders were deceivers so much as that they missed their time and their opportunity.

Since the last war, however, our democracy has made great progress. All classes have become more politically conscious, and they are not now so easily misled by empty slogans. Education is the great defence of democracy, and education has taken strides forward in recent years.

But one factor is liable to militate against the control by the people of the post-war development. This war more than any of its predecessors has drawn in almost every man and woman in the country. There has been no normalcy, no rest for any. The whole population will be vastly wearied when the end comes and it will be harder than ever before to stir the people to a realisation of how easily their democratic power may be used for what may seem plausible, but will turn out to be disastrous, purposes.

Our own native vigour of mind and body alone will be able to save us from the soothing call to rest and restoration. It is for this reason that the Youth of our country will have so important a part to play in our survival.

The atmosphere of the battle, the driving force of self-sacrifice will have gone, the note of urgency and endeavour will have passed. Let me remind you in one quotation of what Field-Marshal Smuts has said about the quality of peace :

“If war in future is to be rendered impossible we must see to it that its function, so far as it has been beneficial in the past, be discharged by some other means. Peace must be dynamic ; it must keep the door open to reform and to freedom and must not become an incubus on human progress. The springs of

reform, of progress and of freedom must not be frozen under a deadly peace."

The beneficence of war of which the Field-Marshal speaks is its power to change intolerable situations, that is its revolutionary power. We must make peace, too, capable of revolutionary change if we are to rid ourselves of war.

We, as a people, have chosen, and chosen deliberately, the way of democratic change, which has its drawbacks and its delays, but which we believe, since we are democrats, can be used to work the will of the people.

We approach now one of those rare and great testing times of the power of our democracy. Can it prevent the spell from being broken, can it mobilise the longings, the hopes, the desires of the mass of the people to be effective against the interests of reaction and the apathy of war-weariness?

We do not want to repeat once again the experience after other wars. We can see that action taken earlier and a greater effort by the people might have changed the whole history of our country and perhaps the world.

This time, at least, we are forewarned of the dangers of apathy. Nevertheless, we may easily fail not only to make progress, but to preserve our democracy itself. Defeated totalitarianism may, like the French Revolution, impress its forms and ideas upon the victorious nations unless we are awake to the danger and determined in the action that we shall take.

The war has developed for us many mechanisms for political and economic co-operation, many controls and much machinery of planning. These we have created because the call for efficiency has been held to over-ride every special interest. This same spirit, this same stress upon the supreme priority of the common weal we must carry through the Armistice and into the peace. Much that we have built up for purposes of war we can adapt quickly and easily to the needs of peace.

Those needs are many; a closer knit and more soundly planned co-operation between the United Nations; a world economy based, not on scarcity and starvation, but upon plenty and happiness, and a means of giving the world a degree of effective security in which we can exercise the arts of peace, rather than those of war.


SHALL THE SPELL BE BROKEN ?

But over and above all these is the need for higher standards and better living conditions for the common people in every country of the world. Our business is to secure this, first and foremost for our own people. It can be done. We have the productive capacity if we like to use it, but we must decide in whose interest that power of production is to be used when the war is over.

That is a decision which must be taken by the electors of our democracy. It is a simple and a fundamental decision, which, once taken, the experts and the technicians must be instructed to implement. The time to agree upon that basic principle of priorities is now, while we still co-operate for the purpose of victory. By so doing we can make certain that our victory will not be barren, and will stretch out and through the years of peace as well as those of war.

I have pictured to you the difficulties ; I have pointed the prospect. I throw you a challenge to your spirit of adventure and of patriotism. The meaning of that challenge has nowhere been better expressed than by a son, a very distinguished son, of this University of Aberdeen. Do you remember the words that Eric Linklater in one of his plays puts into the mouth of Beethoven ? Let me end by reading them to you :

“Do not think peace to be a shallow or a placid thing. It is deep and rich. It is full of movement and joy, of work and laughter, and the reaching out of your hands to God. That is the peace of a living soul. Have nothing to do with any thin or idle peace, mere rest from toil and relapse from war. That is the peace of dying.”



II.

THE ELECTION

(A) WHY IS AN ELECTION NECESSARY ?

Widnes, 6th May, 1945

THERE ARE MANY suggestions being put forward to-day by our opponents that it is unfortunate that the Labour Party are going to precipitate a general election and how much more desirable it would be if we could continue with a combined Government of all parties for the next few years.

I think it is very necessary that the people should understand why it is that an election is essential and why that election should be fought on what are called "Party lines."

First, then, why is an election necessary? The reason for that should be quite clear and no democrat should have the least hesitation in accepting the arguments.

This present Parliament was elected upon issues which are to-day wholly irrelevant to any of our problems. It was elected ten years ago, before the war started, and indeed before it was imminent. The electors then were thinking in quite different terms from those of to-day and did not give any mandate to their representatives to decide upon the problems that will so urgently need decision in the next two or three years. In addition to that there are now on the register, or should be, a vast number of young people who were too young to take part in the last election, and it is just this age-group, the 20's-30's, who have done most in sacrifice and endurance to save our country and our civilisation during the war.

If we were to embark upon our post-war policies without giving them an opportunity to express their opinions we should be depriving them of their democratic rights and so of all right to take part in the decisions as to the future, a right they have

indeed merited by their courage and endurance during the war.

Anyone who suggests that an election is not necessary now is suggesting that the flower of our fighting services should be disfranchised at the most critical time to them for decisions as to their future.

It is understandable that the Conservative Party officials who are responsible for their head office organisation should be desperately anxious to continue their unrepresentative majority in this Parliament. They have already had more power for many years than they would have done with the normal operation of the constitution, and they want to prolong that power and to prevent the people from making any change to the disadvantage of the Conservatives. In fact they suggest that it would be best for the country to allow them to hang on to power when it is quite clear from such by-elections as that at Chelmsford that that is not what the people of the country want.

I hope we shall not hear any more of the undesirability of an election, because I am sure that responsible politicians of all parties recognise the need to give the people an opportunity to have their say now as to the future before it is too late.

The only reason we have set aside the constitutional necessity of having an election every five years is because with the blackout, blitzes and bombs it was not practicable to hold an election earlier. Now that Germany has been crushed there is no longer any need to prevent the people from having their say.

The second question is—if we are to have an election, how should it be fought? There is one point certainly upon which the leaders of all parties are in agreement and that is that we can't have what is called a "coupon" election.

A coupon election is one in which the leaders of a Government made up of the main parties as is the present Government—a coalition—between them select one candidate—of one of these parties—in each constituency to whom they all give their support. It is, practically, very like the totalitarian form of election from a single panel of candidates selected by the Government in power. That obviously is undemocratic and would not be tolerable. The only alternative is for the parties to

THE ELECTION

separate in good time before the election so that each can put its case to the electors and then to go to the country on the basis of their various programmes.

That is the democratic way that we shall adopt in this country and it is the only way in which the electors can have a proper chance of making their wishes known.

There is indeed no democratic alternative to a party fight !

Why some of our opponents are trying to raise a prejudice against the Labour Party on the need for and the manner of the election is because they know that their own positive policies are too weak to stand up alone without prejudice or misrepresentation to assist them.

There is another argument—if one can dignify it with the name of argument—that is being used in a sort of double form.

It is said—But who can provide the leadership necessary in this difficult post-war period except the Conservatives ? and then as the answer to that question looks a bit doubtful it is added that the Conservatives will ask any public-spirited individuals they can get to join them to form another National Government.

We know from our past experience how clearly the Conservatives love to camouflage their conservatism under the guise of National, with the implication that anyone who is not prepared to toe the Conservative line as an adjunct to the Conservative Party is acting unworthily and unpatriotically.

Now the circumstances of a Government and a Parliament whose sole objective is to win a war are quite different from those of a Government and Parliament whose job it is going to be to work out a positive policy for the long-distance future of the country and the world.

Indeed it must already be obvious, that in quite a wide range of domestic problems of the first order, a policy of compromise is not possible because diametrically opposed views are held on fundamental points.

But those points must be resolved one way or another and to do that we must have a Government with a single and undivided mind on fundamentals.

It is true some individuals with different party titles may be

found who will consent to the policies of Conservatism. Such people as the National Liberals are of course in fact indistinguishable from Tories and they should be part of the Conservative Party, and no doubt would be unless they felt their chances wouldn't be so good if they were actually to declare themselves in their true colours. No doubt they will continue to cling on to the tail of the Conservative Party. But there is no question of anyone from other political parties such as the Labour Party who has any political knowledge or sense allying himself with the Conservatives. To do so would entail accepting the Conservative Party policy. It would make the issues much clearer for the electors if the Conservatives would not try and hide their darkness under the bushel of Nationalism.

As to leadership, we do not in this country of ours believe in the Fuehrer principle—I doubt if many Germans believe in it much longer !

We have always believed in and practised Cabinet leadership, that is team leadership, and we do not need to discuss alternatives in terms of single personalities.

The Labour Party representatives in the Cabinet—and I don't include myself amongst them as I went into the Cabinet as an Independent and have only just changed that status for membership of the Party*—the Labour Party representatives have not held all the easiest posts, nor I am aware that any of them have failed to justify the expectations of the people in the way in which they have carried out their jobs.

The Admiralty, the Ministry of Labour, the Home Office and Home Security, the Board of Trade, the Lord Presidency of the Council, and post of Deputy Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for Scotland, to mention only some of them, are all posts of the utmost importance which have been well and faithfully carried out, and no one need be in any doubt as to the capability of those who have held these posts through long and trying years of war being able to cope with the post-war problems.

I don't think any other political party team can show a better record of service and leadership. That too seems to me

* Sir Stafford applied for and received re-admission to the Labour Party in March, 1945.

THE ELECTION

to be a line of prejudice introduced by our opponents to help to divert attention from the real issues, which depend upon policies and not upon personalities.

I should not personally have rejoined the Labour Party unless I had felt that it was the one and only political instrument by which it was practicable to attain those objectives for the country which I have long had at heart.

So let us dispose of these irrelevancies, which I have only mentioned in order to dismiss them, and let us challenge our opponents to fight the coming election on the merits of their policies rather than upon personalities, suggestions and misrepresentations.

This coming election is far too important from the point of view of the future of our country and of the world for any of us who have that future at heart to try and confuse the electors. We want to make the matter as clear as we can to them so that they may make up their minds in good time as to which way they will cast their votes.

We have defeated Fascism and Nazism, we have asserted the superiority of democracy as a way of Government; let us then see to it that we give our democracy every chance to adopt the right policies as we see them, and to do what we believe to be the right thing.

We are, however, convinced from the experience of the world in the last thirty years, including two world wars and the intervening period of peace, that it is impossible under modern circumstances to provide the opportunity of full employment for our people without that sort of planning and control which has brought us such large dividends of production during two world wars, and without which we failed so signally in the period between the two wars.

We may well ask what it is that has altered in the conduct and organisation of private enterprise since the pre-war period that is going to turn the admitted failure of that system to provide full employment between the two wars into a capacity to provide full employment after this war. The answer is that there has been no change whatever. Exactly the same methods are contemplated by the Conservatives as failed in years between 1919 and 1939.

That is the reason why to-day the people as a whole are determined, if they can avoid it, not to go back to the conditions that ruled pre-war. There is a general desire both amongst civilians and in the armed forces to get a better deal for the common people, though many people feel that they don't know quite how that is to be brought about.

It must, however, be clear to anyone who thinks at all that the basic principle to be applied is that the overriding interests of the community must take precedence over any partial sectional or personal interests of any individuals. We haven't changed human nature by five and a half years of war, though a great many people have realised, perhaps for the first time, what we can do as a nation when we put national before individual interests.

It is of no use leaving things as they were and expecting that private enterprise is going to behave itself in a new way. If we as a community want a change in outlook we must create the conditions and the controls which will prevent people from allowing their individual and selfish interests to interfere with the needs of the State and of the mass of the people. That is precisely what we have had to do during the war, because we were up against a matter of life and death. Is there any less need when the war is over? Surely it is just as important, if not more important, for us to secure decent conditions for our people in times of peace, conditions which can maintain that peace, as it was to win the war. It is in reality the final stage of success in the war. For if we fail to establish the prosperity and happiness of our country as a sequel to our war effort, we shall have failed to reap the benefit of all the tragedy and suffering that we have been through.

It is not difficult to understand why private enterprise cannot of itself bring about full employment and so maximum production in the country.

We have learnt during the war how complicated and difficult a job it is to fit in all the hundreds of thousands of different types of production required so as to give us the multitude of different end products we needed with which we could fight and defeat the enemy.

That could never have been done by just leaving the matter

THE ELECTION

to private individuals to choose and order production without any knowledge of the equally important rival needs of others. Someone had to fit all these requirements together into a single picture and then allocate for them the labour, factory space and materials that were needed. In that way we have been able to produce the very maximum that was possible with the least possible waste, and what is equally important, we have been able to produce just those things that were needed and that enabled us to defeat the enemy.

Now why should we not use exactly the same principle in satisfying the urgent post-war needs of our people? It can't be said that we shall not need as much. The more we can produce the higher will be our standard of living and we just cannot afford the wastage of unemployment or of the production of unnecessary luxuries if we are going even to maintain our pre-war standards of living, much less improve them.

It is quite true that the owners of some industries won't have the unlimited freedom to exploit the markets and the consumers that they would like to have, but the common people will get much more in the form of consumable goods and food, and we in the Labour Party are definitely interested in those people who have to work for their living and not so much in those who live by their investments.

We believe that the happiness and prosperity of mankind are vastly more important to our society than the particular interests in property or private enterprise of any section of the population. That, of course, has been the key note of our war time effort. That is why it has been so amazingly successful. The Government with the fullest sanction from the people has taken every step that was necessary to prevent any individuals putting their own selfish interests before the needs of the nation's defence and victory.

We want the same spirit and the same powers in the Government to carry through the equally important and more difficult job of re-establishing our people in their homes and in full employment after the war. And the Labour Party will be satisfied with nothing less.

We certainly don't believe that our great industries like the coal industry are the concern of the coal owners only,

nor even of the coal miners. Every individual in the country is intimately concerned in the quantity and price of the coal that is raised and so is every industry.

Coal is a great national asset, our most important material asset, and the economy and efficiency of the mining of it and the conditions of those who work in the pits is a matter of vital importance to every citizen.

The recent report of exports published by the Government shows how sadly ill-organised and neglected the industry has been and proves beyond all doubt that it must be reorganised on a better and sounder basis.

The miners and the Labour Party have been saying that for years and now at last the industry's own technicians have condemned it root and branch.

It is up to the nation to put those conditions right and to take the control out of the hands of those who have mismanaged the industry in the past.

There is no other sensible action to take, except that which has been recommended again and again—to nationalise the industry.

That is only one example of an important industry that must be planned and controlled in a particular way.

Others may need different methods. It is not so important exactly how it is done as to achieve the results that are required—that is, a planned and orderly production of the things that are needed by the people.

(B) ECONOMICS IS NOT ENOUGH

From "Picture Post," June, 1945.

Any of us looking round the world to-day must be brought up against one very certain conclusion. It is not new machines or fresh political expedients that we need so much as decent moral principles.

The human race has excelled itself in the invention of all kinds of material things. What it lacks to-day is the moral and spiritual power to control what it has created.

When we come to discuss and consider the programmes of

THE ELECTION

the rival political parties let us remember that it is the purpose behind their policies, what we might call their political philosophy, that is of such supreme importance.

It is high purpose alone that can provide the power and determination which we shall need if we are to reach those objectives, that are common to almost all parties.

During the war we have all shared the inspiration of the desire for victory over evil. We have not fought to advantage ourselves or to win territories. That single-minded purpose has enabled us to perform wonders of heroism and of production in the most difficult circumstances. We might well have said before we had that inspiration, that it was impossible for so many people to work such long hours under blitz and black-out and accomplish so much, but we know now that if the inspiration is there we can indeed perform wonders. The most ordinary people have shown themselves heroes, the laziest have worked hard.

But it is not any cry or slogan that can give us the urge of devotion. We are responsive to national demand for self-sacrifice such as we experienced in the famous days of Dunkirk, but the call to work for some narrow sectional interest or to support a claim of privilege or preference has no effect upon the people. It is the common danger or the common interest that brings out the common effort.

Therein lies the deep contrast between the Labour and the Conservative outlooks in politics.

The Labour Party, with its strong backing of Christian socialism and with its origin in the wide working-class movements, has always been inspired by a spirit of comradeship and moral purpose. It has always believed, as it believes now, that human beings are the most precious asset of our civilisation, and that the development and care of humanity should be the first charge upon all our resources. It holds, too, that no accident of birth, no comparison between wealth and poverty, should prejudice the chance of any child born to our nation. All are not and cannot be equal, some are more copiously endowed with gifts than others, but it is our very Christian duty to see that all have an equal opportunity to make their peculiar contribution to the welfare of the community.

That is why the Labour Party insists that the most important items in any political programme are those calculated to bring peace, happiness and prosperity to the greatest number of our people. As part of such prosperity we hope they will have the opportunity to enjoy far more personal possessions than they have ever had before, and to afford more by way of enjoyment, relaxation and travel. Such personal belongings are essential to a full and happy life, as those who are lucky enough to possess them know full well.

When, however, it is a question of owning the kind of property that enables one person to exercise power over another or to exploit the public, that is an entirely different matter. Such property—not necessary for the personal enjoyment of his life by the individual—must be a secondary consideration.

Land ownership must not stand in the way of proper housing or means of communication ; financial power, the ownership and control of money, must be used primarily to stimulate the production and flow of goods for the people, and not as a means of speculation or profit for individuals ; industry must be so planned and organised as to produce the things the people need and to give good and secure employment for all. In fact all our material possessions, all our national assets, must be used in the service of the community and not to give power or profit to the greedy and acquisitive.

Reading the other day that remarkable book "The Soldier looks ahead," by Captain X, who has since given his life for his country, I came across this passage which seems to me to provide an unanswerable argument :—

"People have seen how a total effort can conquer Hitler. They will the more readily be convinced that the same total effort, the same fierce spirit, is what is needed to conquer poverty, slums and unemployment. Before the war people were much impressed by the claims of private property. They were apt to be convinced that to nationalise the land or industry was 'robbery.' To-day we know that no landlord, no industrialist would possess a pennyworth of private property had not the flesh and blood of Britain's men and women been sacrificed in destroying the criminals who sought to seize

our country. Britain's property would have been Nazi property but for the fighter pilots, the minesweeper crews, the Commandos, the Home Guard, the firemen and the munition workers. The property that has been preserved by all this sacrifice belongs not to one small clique but to the whole people."

If the salvation of our national assets, of all the things that we all possess has been a common effort by all the people, then surely the future use of those resources must be organised in the interests of the many and not of the few. The people who were great enough to offer or sacrifice their lives are surely worthy of the first consideration as regards the future.

Can anyone deny those propositions? We can, of course, invent excuses why our own particular individual interests should receive special consideration. We can make a claim, as it were, for exemption from the general rule that all our national resources must be used in the national interest, but we cannot deny the general proposition. It is the standards of Christian service that we must apply to these problems, and if we do, then we cannot ask that our special interests be exempted, for that would be crude selfishness.

So far I have put before you the Labour outlook. What of the Conservatives? They will say, as they have so often said before, that by some curious chance of economics the private enterprise which provides a good living and luxurious standards for the property owner is also best for the nation as a whole. They will claim that private property in land, in finance and in industry has some peculiar sanctity greater even than that of human life. I can find no warrant for that sanctity in the Christian gospels; it appears to me to be a convenient invention of those who want to hang on to what they have got, however much the people as a whole may suffer as the result.

Never let us forget that in those years so full of tragedy and hardship for the ordinary people of our country between the two wars, the Conservatives possessed unchallengeable political power for eighteen out of twenty-one years. During all that time they failed, and failed disastrously, to arrive at the results they now promise by a return to the same methods as produced their complete failure.

In the result, Conservatism places the interests of private

property above those of the individual human being ; they care first for things then for people.

At this coming election you will have to decide on this broad issue of morality ; are you in favour of the selfish care of private and individual property and profit or do you want to ensure that the whole resources of our nation are used in the service of the people ?

(C) WHAT IS OUR PROBLEM ?

From the " Sunday Pictorial," June, 1945.

When you go house-hunting or shopping in these times you very quickly realise two things: first that there is not enough to meet your requirements, and second that a good deal of what there is is much more expensive than it should be.

During the great difficulties of the war we have done our best by careful planning to make the most essential commodities available for civilian use, and by price regulation to stop excessive prices being charged. But of course the circumstances of war production have made it impossible to keep you supplied with all you need. Nevertheless, by rationing and coupon schemes we have managed to have fair shares for everyone of those goods which were in short supply.

But now the time is coming when we can devote more of our energies to producing civilian goods, when, in fact, we can get back by degrees to peace-time conditions. What you and I are asking ourselves is what those conditions are to be like.

A great many of you will still remember the conditions after the last war. You will recollect the high hopes with which many of us looked forward in November, 1918, and the promises that were then made by the Government. Not long after an election followed and the promises of better conditions were repeated. Does the phrase "Homes fit for heroes" remind you of those times ?

I remember it very well and I remember too how eagerly all the people supported the idea.

But the sequel was nothing like the promises. Prices rushed

THE ELECTION

up and the homes fit for heroes never materialised at all. Instead of that there was the most gross profiteering, the financial sharks got away with a great part of the ex-servicemen's gratuities and savings, and very soon it became a common thing to see our bemedalled heroes begging in the gutter or queueing up to try and get a job.

Now there is every bit as much danger of the same conditions overwhelming us after this war ; indeed more danger because there has been more dislocation and upset to our normal life than there was during the last war. The steps which we failed to take last time we must take this time or else we shall only have ourselves to blame if we fall once again into misfortune.

It is about this method of preventing a recurrence of the tragedies which followed the last war, domestic tragedies of every kind, that the election issues will be fought.

What is our problem ? It is to produce enough of the right things, at a reasonable cost, to make the houses and fill the shops so as to enable the least highly paid workers to obtain them.

That may sound simple, but we must remember that it is something that we have never yet been able to do in our country. We have always had poverty, want, and unemployment, sometimes a little more, sometimes a little less, but these evils have always affected a large proportion of our people, and a much larger number have lived in constant anxiety lest they too should be overwhelmed by these misfortunes.

Now I hold that we as a nation have a responsibility to see that we provide everyone with the necessities of life, including reasonable opportunities for healthy relaxation and enjoyment and an adequate education, and we must do this before we waste any of our energies upon luxury production. Just as we have had to concentrate during the war upon the needs for defence, so we must in the peace concentrate on the necessities for our people.

The Labour Party's programme is based upon that responsibility. We do not believe that it is right or proper to leave the provision of these vitally important matters to the chance of the market, to the vagaries and chaos of Private Enterprise,

which has always hitherto failed, and failed dismally, to produce either the goods required or full employment for our people.

Let me take as an example of what I mean the commodity that directly and indirectly affects our lives and comfort more than any other—coal.

We know, from the experience of the shortages that there have been, how trying to health and happiness the absence of coal, gas or electricity can be, especially through our cold and damp winters. We don't realise quite so clearly how the price of coal enters into every single article that we have to buy. It is the basis of all the power in our manufacturing industries and of all our transport so that an unnecessarily high cost of mining due to inefficiency, antiquated methods, bad management or bad relations between the owners and workers, increases the cost of living by putting up the price of all manufactured and transported articles we have to buy.

There have been any number of reports on the Coal Industry over the last twenty-five years and every one of them has stressed the need for the reorganisation of the industry. Partial attempts of one sort and another have been made to improve matters, always upon the basis of maintaining the private ownership of the mines, and none of them have succeeded.

The Labour Party, the miners—three-quarters of a million of them—and numerous other bodies have insisted that there was only one cure, to plan and reorganise the industry under National Control, using the best brains in the country and making available all the machinery and labour necessary to introduce the most modern mining methods. It is admitted on all hands that "Private Enterprise" has so far failed, has made a mess of the industry, and yet the Conservatives solidly refuse to lay hands upon this citadel of their power and so all the people suffer and will go on suffering until they force a cure for this state of affairs of the kind that I have pointed out.

Of course you may ask, will this be a remedy? Fortunately, there is a completely satisfactory answer.

Take the industry with which I myself have been particularly concerned during the war—the most modern industry in the country, Aircraft Production. We have found that by supplying all the capital necessary to make the industry completely

THE ELECTION

up to date, by planning and controlling the output, by arranging the pooling of ideas and so on, we have been able to bring the industry up to a very high point of efficiency. We could do those things quite easily because the Government was the sole customer of the industry and so had complete control of its output. At one time there were 15,000 different producing units working on the job and the production from each was planned to produce its particular share of the whole. Waste was largely obviated and a very remarkable volume of production and a high degree of efficiency and quality—which means comparatively low prices—was achieved.

But in peace time we cannot expect the private firms in an industry, where the Government is not the sole buyer, to comply in the same way as they have done under war circumstances. Moreover in the Coal Industry there has not been that same degree of close control.

In short, we must in peace-time conditions, in a fundamentally important industry like coal mining, ensure efficiency and proper planning in the only way that it is possible to ensure it, that is, by national ownership of the whole industry.

That does not necessarily apply to every kind of industrial production, but it does apply to those like coal, steel, power and transport which are really basic services for the people.

That may sound a great innovation of our industrial life and some people might think that it would "upset" a lot of people in industry. That is not the case at all. The only people who will be upset are the owners—just a handful; on the other hand, the great majority of the technicians, staffs and workers will feel, and rightly feel, that this reorganisation will give them the best chance—which they have always wanted—to make their greatest contribution, not to making profits for the owners, but to producing the needed goods for the people.

In other industries which are not suitable for immediate national ownership, we must have a proper plan to produce the right things and the power to see that the plan is carried out. The plan must lay down the sort of goods to be produced, the amount of labour and materials we can afford to allocate to them and the price at which they are to be sold. That is just exactly what we have done with such success for the supply

of warlike materials. We shall need the statistical facts upon which to base our planning and also the organisation to supervise the carrying out of the plan—the progressing of the plan—just as we have had in the Supply Departments during the war.

If we are prepared to use these modern methods to meet the modern needs of our people there is no reason whatever why we should not provide full employment and at the same time supply the people with a reasonable variety of all the goods they require at fair prices.

The only alternative suggested by the Tories is to return to pre-war conditions. They again promise all the inducements, all the schemes of reorganisation that were proliferated in the inter-war years and which failed so signally to effect any cure of our evils.

That is not what we have fought this war for. Our soldiers sailors and airmen have done a magnificent job, but it wasn't to protect the profits of a small, privileged section of the community. They have suffered, died and been imprisoned that the people of this country, the ordinary men and women, might have a better and happier life and might control their own future destiny.

That is exactly what the Labour Party demands, that is the basis of their policy, and it is for that reason that they ask you to come in as members of the great people's army that is marching forward to progress side by side with the peoples of Europe.

To look backward to pre-war methods, to relapse once again into the chaos of private enterprise that brought in its train so many hardships for all but the rich, is to invite the same disastrous sequel to this war as the last generation experienced after the first Great War.

I am convinced that the people of the British Isles, who have shown their courage and dogged endurance over the last five and a half years, will be equally courageous in their approach to the future and will take that future into their own hands under the well-tried leadership of the Labour Party.

(D) THE CENTURY OF THE COMMON MAN

B.B.C. Broadcast, 20th June, 1945.

One day in early 1941, I was driving through the streets of Moscow with a friend who remarked on the casual way in which people were streaming all over the road. He said, rather petulantly "The way these people walk about you'd think they owned the place." I replied "They do !"

I wish I could say the same of this country. Of course, during the war, though we haven't as a people actually owned the country for which we've fought, we have at least controlled it. In the case of many great houses and private parks, the notice "Private Property" has come down and they have been taken over at a fair rental for some national use ; indeed all our resources have been put at the disposal of the Nation. They had to be or we could never have planned their most efficient use and so won the war.

Well, what about the peace? Are there no battles to be fought to win the peace ? Aren't poverty, insecurity, lack of housing, unemployment, disease and ignorance, those breeding grounds for war and unrest, as important enemies and as fatally dangerous to our future and our happiness as were the Nazis and the Fascists ?

And how are we to fight them ? How are we to get for our children the things we didn't have, the full employment that was so completely unattainable during the eighteen years of Conservative power between the two wars, the better education that is offered but still has to materialise, the higher standards of living and enjoyment that we've often been promised but never seen, the homes, especially for the young married couples, which still seem as far off as ever ?

A good many of you who are listening to-night will remember the end of the last war. Do you recall the thrill of Armistice Day, 1918, the feeling that we really were at last entering upon a new era in our history ? Our fighting men were promised that they should come back to a country fit for heroes. And what did they come back to ? Slums and unemployment, ex-servicemen begging at the street corners, long queues seeking a job and the dole with all its anxieties and sorrows.

The people were fooled ; oh yes, they were. That country fit for heroes to live in never existed except upon paper and in election promises.

You can't persuade me that we couldn't have got it if we'd really been prepared to go out after it. I know well what the British people can do when they set themselves to it. No ! it wasn't that we couldn't do it, but we didn't insist strongly enough that these promises should be turned into the actual things we want—houses, jobs, schools, and all the rest. We allowed ourselves to be fooled and misled without ever looking to see how the promises were to be fulfilled.

Well, here we are at the end of another world war, another agony of suffering and heroism. One that might so easily have been lost if you had not insisted in 1940 upon changing the Tory Government under Mr. Chamberlain for a Government of all Parties under Mr. Churchill. It doesn't bode well for the country that so many of Mr. Chamberlain's collaborators are back again in this revived Tory Government.

What are we going to do now ? Allow ourselves to be made fools of again by paper promises based on the same old futile policies ? Or shall we learn the lesson of last time and insist not upon talk, but on doing the things that are necessary to make this a country really fit for the men and women of the fighting services, and for those millions who have toiled so hard in industry, mines, fields and in our homes ?

Don't let us stand for any "can't afford it," or "can't do it" attitude, nor indeed for those disingenuous optimists of conservatism who say that if we go back to the pre-war condition of affairs and give private enterprise the same free hand it has always had in peace time all will be well.

We know what conditions were produced by the pre-war policies. Listen to this roll call of the unemployed and think what it meant in human suffering to the unemployed and their families : 1932, 2,800,000 ; 1934, 2,200,000 ; 1936, 1,800,000 ; 1938, 1,900,000. And all that time the Conservatives had a huge majority in Parliament and could do exactly what they liked ! Either they didn't try and so ought never to be given power again, or they tried their best and failed, which proves

THE ELECTION

their policies useless. If we want new and better conditions we must have new and better policies.

If you want decent hours, full employment, social security and fair conditions, wages and salaries at your work, you have got to insist upon a Government that puts those first things first.

We haven't fought and suffered in this war to protect the private power of property of the financiers and industrialists and their ability to exploit the people of the country. We've struggled desperately to protect our homes and families from the enemy and to assert our right to give the ordinary people a decent and happy life.

And while we've been fighting we've been hard put to it—as we shall be after the war—to get enough produced to support and protect our people. But we've done it victoriously, and how have we done it? By careful planning and control by the Government. And that's the way and the only way we shall defeat poverty and unemployment after the war.

Our country and our commonwealth must be powerful and strong because we want to be able to give leadership to the world towards greater peace and prosperity. But we can't be strong if we waste our substance in unemployment and in producing the wrong things. We must have plans and priorities as we have had for war production, so that we can give all our people full employment and really make enough of the right things to give them decent standards, before we waste anything on unnecessary luxuries.

Now I have had a good deal of experience of planning and controlling industry both in the last war, as a factory manager, and in this, as Minister of Aircraft Production. I know from that experience what has been done and can be done to increase production if we have, as we have had during both wars, national planning and control of our resources.

Don't imagine that in those tragic years between the two wars there was no planning and control of industry in our country. Far from it. Every factory had its own plan; there were tens of thousands of competing plans, and each one based upon what principle? Upon how the greatest profit could be made out of that particular manufacture. It didn't matter

whether it was of luxury goods for the few or low-priced goods for the many, the only test was how much profit could be made out of it.

That is private enterprise, that is what it means, and it by no means follows, as you know, that the articles which bring the most profits are those most needed by the people. In fact, the very contrary is often the case ; the things needed by the very poor have to be sold at low prices and are generally not as profitable to manufacturers as the things sold at high prices to the rich. So the rich get what they want while the poor go without.

Private enterprise, too, often tends to keep *down* output so as to keep *up* prices ; an artificial scarcity is created to maintain profits, and for that purpose, too, prices are controlled.

Let me give you one example. The steel required for building Wembley Town Hall. Sixteen different tenders were sent in, each one identical in amount. Now someone had controlled those prices, and in whose interests ? Not in the interests of the people, but of profits for some individuals.

So in the past our industry has been planned and controlled by private enterprise but upon an entirely wrong basis. We want to change those controls, to take them out of the anonymous and irresponsible hands of private individuals and place them in the hands of the people's representatives, the Government.

That way we succeeded in winning the war and in that way we can provide our people with their needs in the peace.

There is another aspect of this question which particularly affects certain of our older industries. We can't afford to let private enterprise muddle along in inefficiency, or combine into cartels to hold the public up to ransom. We might as well have tried to fight the war with a private enterprise army, navy and air force.

Just imagine the absurdity of Messrs. Smith and Co.'s Grenadiers advertised as the best-fed and equipped unit, or Messrs. Robinson's most up-to-date aircraft carriers the world has ever seen, with bright and attractive but serviceable uniforms for their crews, and expecting that sort of thing to win a war. Not the wildest lunatic would suggest it, but that's how it is

THE ELECTION

suggested by the Conservatives that we should conduct the forces with which we must fight all the peace-time evils of our society.

Can't you picture the privateers in the days of Queen Elizabeth protesting against the idea of a nationalised navy and arguing that private enterprise—which was most profitable to the adventurers—was the one and only efficient way of organising our sea forces ?

Well, that is exactly what is being said to-day about our coal supply, our power, our transport and our great basic industries like steel and cotton, and yet isn't it obvious that in the modern world they are as vital to the national interest, to the lives and safety of the people, as the navy ? Though the job of organising them is a different one, it is certainly no more complicated.

One of our great complaints against private enterprise, emphasised by many official committees and commissions, is its failure to keep up-to-date with machinery, buildings and methods. Many of you who serve on Joint Production Committees know only too well the truth of this charge.

Industrial education, personnel management, research and development have also been neglected to swell the dividends.

That can't go on unless we are to go under as a leading industrial nation.

Our technicians and scientists are the best in the world ; they have done a magnificent job in the war, but they don't have a fair chance, nor do our skilled workers. Many of these are far more competent to help plan and direct our industries in the national interest than many of the existing directors or the sort of managers who are put in because of family influence, regardless of their training.

Our industries ought to be conducted by fully trained managers and technicians who know their job, and they ought not to be restrained and controlled in exercising their proper initiative by financiers and speculators or their nominees who have no knowledge of or interest in the technical processes employed. Many of the existing directors who are often wholly uncontrolled by the shareholders should be replaced by really

first-class men. The workers, too, must have their full part in advising upon methods and processes. To-day they often have to watch things going from bad to worse, knowing that the end will mean for them unemployment.

The industries of our country are a national asset and should not be the sole preserve of private interests. We must use to the full the initiative of the individual worker—whether he be manager, foreman or machine operator. This we can do if we have national control and planning, combined with freedom to an efficient individual staff to conduct the factory in the best way.

We need, too, far more research and development in our industries and the country must provide the necessary advanced education and plan the services required. We must give to the scientist and the technician their proper place in the national service. These highly skilled people, upon whom so much of our future depends and who have produced such marvels as radar, jet propulsion and Mulberry Harbours, should not be left in obscurity until their services are urgently needed by the State. They must be given an honourable place and good conditions in which to pursue their researches. Only by so doing shall we be able to get the full benefit of their outstanding knowledge and ability.

Private enterprise in many industries has sadly failed and we cannot allow our people to go on suffering because of that failure, merely to advantage or convenience a small number of owners.

We are charged with a tremendous responsibility at this moment in the life of our nation—a responsibility that you cannot shift on to the shoulders of others. If you love and honour your country, if you are stirred by a passionate desire for a fair future for this "land of such dear souls, this dear, dear land, dear for her reputation through the world," to use Shakespeare's words, then you must now be alert and active as a citizen.

Hundreds of thousands of our young men and women have suffered and died that we might live on in freedom, that we might preserve those democratic rights that their forefathers fought and struggled to win. It is for us who survive to make

THE ELECTION

that democracy worthy of the name, to show that we have the courage to use our democratic rights to attain for our country those benefits that will form the most lasting and fitting memorial of their sacrifice.

It is no simple task. The ways of peace will prove themselves as hard maybe as the paths of war, but with this difference ; we shall be building up a solid structure of happiness for the world, rather than destroying lives and devastating towns and cities so laboriously constructed in the past.

But we need the same determination and self-sacrifice and the same sense of values that have brought us through to victory in the war.

All our national resources must be placed at the service of our people—of you who have striven and worked and fought so valiantly through the hard trials of war.

To those many young people who will be voting in this election for the first time I would say : Don't curb your enthusiasm or damp down your ardour. You will have to live through the future for which we now lay the foundations. Help us by your imagination and your vigour to drive forward fearlessly into a new and better world. We need your enthusiasm and vitality, linked with that of your comrades the world over, if we are to break with the evil ways and out-worn traditions of the past.

We—in the Labour Party—are in the most deadly earnest in our purpose. We seek no easily won power or cheap success ; we want no last minute stunts in this desperately serious election ; we know and we emphasise the difficulties that lie ahead, but we know too that the ordinary men and women of this country can overcome them if they will.

We have entered, as has been said, upon the Century of the Common Man and we claim as his representatives the support of the electors, confident in our power to redeem the future of our country, by subordinating every sectional interest to the greater common good.

Our nation will never rise supreme unless behind all our acts and instincts in all our policies is some great moral purpose. Greed and profit, opportunism and material gain are no foundation upon which to build a great society.

DEMOCRACY ALIVE

There lies behind the policies of the Labour Party a great ideal, one for which countless men and women in the past have suffered and died unnamed and unsung, the ideal of service to our fellow men, of comradeship in adversity, of struggle to attain justice and honourable conditions of life for all our people. But it still remains for the electors of Britain to put those ideals into practice, to turn those visions and hopes into the reality of happy experience.

Let those of us who boast the proud title of Christian follow the precepts of our great Teacher and make ourselves the selfless guardians of our neighbours, unconcerned with private wealth and interests, but anxious only to place our all at the service of the community.

III.

THE TASK AHEAD

(A) TO THE EMPLOYERS

*Manchester Chamber of Commerce,
16th November, 1945.*

THE GREAT MEETING place in this city used to be—before the blitzes—the Free Trade Hall, the symbol of the part played by Manchester and Lancashire in the expansion of World Trade throughout the century. Though during the war that symbol was destroyed by the forces of autarchy, yet those forces were themselves in the end overwhelmed by the courage, skill and limitless endeavour of the free peoples of the world.

With that victory we emerge with a new era of history, the keynote of which is the desire of the peoples of the world to blend an orderly conduct of their affairs with as large a degree of personal freedom and initiative as is possible. There is, moreover, one thing upon which the people of every country are loudly insisting and that is the absolute need for achieving decent standards of living through full employment. It is recognised everywhere, and this constitutes a great advance in social thought, that it is the responsibility of Governments both nationally and internationally to help to achieve that measure of full employment.

It was Earl Baldwin who said between the wars that Governments would be judged by their ability to cope with unemployment. We can now make the more positive assertion that they will be judged by their ability to acquire and provide full employment. People are no longer content to leave this vital matter of their day to day standards of living to the chance of individual action. Just as they demanded concerted action and

combined strategy for the victory, so they rightly have decided that we must have the same technique of co-operation in the no less difficult strategy of winning the world markets that are necessary for full employment of our people.

But full employment must be at decent standards so that there can be no question of basing our competitive efforts in export trade upon lowered wages and conditions in our manufacturing industries.

What we need much more than any other country in the world for our prosperity is an expansionist world economy. The more everyone has—the greater the volume of spending power—the better off will be every exporting nation which shares in those expanding markets.

While therefore we want some measure of purposeful direction in the world trade, we do not want hampering controls and barriers. If I may use the well-worn analogy of the river of commerce, we want to turn it into a broad canal with smooth waters, we do not want to dam it and obstruct it. But we of course are only the riparian owners on one side of that river and on one part of that stream. It is of no use our keeping our part free and clear of obstruction if others are to dam back the water by barriers. That is why Article VII of the famous mutual assistance agreement recognised that such freeing of the barriers to trade and commerce must be by international arrangement. We want a commercial T.V.A. scheme to bring prosperity to the world as that scheme has brought prosperity to the great Tennessee valley. We would like to see in international trade that sort of orderly freedom which makes life tolerable and not the free-for-all that damages and endangers the whole structure of world peace.

These matters have, as you know, been much debated in many of their aspects both financial and commercial. The Bretton Woods Agreement which has been ratified by the United States of America, was one part of a plan to introduce orderliness into what has been chaos in the field of foreign exchange. There has been much talk of the reduction of tariff barriers and of tariff preferences. Questions of commodity markets, state trading, quotas and subsidies have all to be explored and discussed with the objective of arriving at some code for the

orderly and free development of world trade upon an expansionist basis.

We cannot ever expect to get advantages for ourselves internationally unless we are prepared to contribute something towards the general pool of co-operative effort. Just as we demand some contribution from others, so we must be prepared to give it ourselves. So often people look at these international arrangements merely from the point of view of their inconvenience to ourselves without any regard to the great benefits we derive from the concessions of others.

Indeed, if in any sphere we are to set the advantages of orderly conduct by others we must be prepared to give up ourselves, to some extent, the right always to do exactly as we like. Anarchy has never yet proved itself a sound basis for the government of our society, nor can it till we reach the ultimate perfection of human nature.

We shall, therefore, welcome any advance towards freer and fuller international trade, but, while we shall be prepared to make our contribution, we have no intention of entering into an arrangement based upon our unilateral concessions.

Now let me turn to the domestic aspect of our export programme and some of the immediate problems that we face. Since VJ Day, now two and a half months ago—a very short time in industrial history—we have got going upon our reconversion. This operation—the simultaneous reconversion of all war production industries in the world—is the greatest industrial operation ever undertaken. Do not let us therefore underestimate its difficulties. Not only are we transforming production everywhere, but at the same time distribution has undergone the most profound changes. To give but one example, Lend Lease and reciprocal Lend Lease which were a year ago responsible for the direction of many billions of dollars' worth of trade have now altogether ceased and that trade or something in its place has to be redirected by new forces into new channels.

We have to remember that the effect of the war on our economy has been to transform it both in quality and quantity. It is not only that we must now turn our production to other things but that we must enable the world to absorb the greatly

increased quantities that the improvement in technique of production has made available.

It is this difficult process in which we now find ourselves involved, and it is perhaps worth while to take stock of our position so that we can see what it is we have got to do and how far, if at all, we have got on with our job.

Even in the year just prior to the war, we were failing to pay our way. But in fighting the war we have had to draw very heavily on our overseas investments, and the end is not yet, for we shall continue to have a deficit until our exports have greatly increased.

We have already forfeited a large part of our overseas investments which before the war provided us with an income sufficient to pay for half our food imports and we have also incurred a vast volume of new debt and shall incur more before we get back on to our feet again. Yet somehow or another we must within the next two or three years achieve a balance with our external payments.

This can only be done by the twin process of reducing imports to the very minimum and expanding exports to the very maximum.

This will make it clear why, during the next few years at any rate, we must maintain a control over imports. We need and must have, certain imports, principally food, raw materials and tobacco and oil and we must see to it that no individual interests are allowed to jeopardise these national necessities. Whether by bulk purchase or licensing, we must continue the import controls.

But so far as exports are concerned, the situation is different. Here we have a large cumulative liability. We must restore the pre-war level of exports, we must further make good the loss of overseas investment income and we must also export to pay off some part of the external debts that have accrued and will accrue. If we can achieve all these three things it will still only secure a rate of imports sufficient to maintain our previous standards of living and those we all want to improve. It has hitherto been commonly accepted that we can achieve all this by an increase of 50 per cent. in our pre-war level of

exports by volume, which means a very much higher percentage if judged by value.

Whether this is so or not will depend to some extent upon how far we can maintain our own war-time production levels of articles that were formerly imported, for example how far we can keep up our agricultural production above pre-war levels.

It may be, therefore, that we shall find ourselves compelled to aim at a still higher level of exports if we wish to maintain our living standards, let alone increase them.

But this is, of course, only a very general average figure. When we come down to examine the particular industries two things are clear. First, that in many of them it is not possible for the present to contemplate an increase of anything like 50 per cent. in exports ; indeed in some of them the exports may actually decrease—coal is the outstanding example. Second, we cannot merely rely upon the old export industries, we must bring into the export field newer industries which have never featured there before.

Thus one thing is clear. Many industries must increase their exports by much more than 50 per cent., if 50 per cent. is to be the average, and new industries must come into the exporting field. Perhaps the most hopeful immediate prospect is in the engineering industry, which has not suffered as other industries have during the war.

If you were to ask me whether there is any limit to the percentage of the production of any industry that should be exported I should answer you only this : we must maintain a minimum of goods at home to satisfy the urgent needs of our own people and we must not prevent the rehabilitation and the improvement of our own industrial equipment by exporting all new equipment abroad.

What do I mean by a minimum of goods to satisfy our own urgent needs ? I mean this, that until we reach or at least have in sight a balance of our trade we must continue austerity standards for our own people. We just cannot afford to relax them if we are to survive as a first-class power in the world. Exports are the only means by which we can get the food our people need and the raw materials upon which they can work.

We must therefore put exports first—all the exports we can squeeze out, and I am sure that once our people realise the necessities of the situation they will tighten their belts as willingly to win this victory as they did to win the victory in the war.

That, at any rate, is the policy which the Government intend to pursue and it follows of course that we cannot, except in the most exceptional cases, make up any deficit of home-made goods by imports from overseas. To do that would be to defeat our own objective.

This is a hard policy for the people who have given their all to the defeat of Nazi aggression during six years of total war and privation, but upon it depends our own future independence. We will not become the economic fief of any other country, we will work out our own salvation by our own strength. We will not sell our birthright of economic freedom for a mess of pottage of temporary comfort or luxury.

So this greatest volume of exports is essential and I would like manufacturers in every industry to concentrate their minds upon the problem of how they can export more and more of their products.

Let me now come to the question of the direction which our exports should take in the world markets.

Generally speaking the Government do not intend to try to canalise exports into any particular market. The reason for this is that, for the present at any rate, our needs for overseas currencies are so general that the complication of directional controls are not worth while. We are anxious to remove all hampering restrictions on exports, as we have already largely done, so as to give the exporters as free a run as possible. That is one of our contributions to the co-operative effort.

If later on the situation changes, we shall try, by giving advice to exporters generally or in particular cases, to influence the goods towards the most desirable markets.

Nevertheless, we are anxious that exporters should themselves exercise care as to the markets to which they send their goods. At the moment it is said that you can sell almost anything anywhere, at any price. That is true to a great extent, and it therefore makes it all the more necessary that we should

use this period of a sellers' market to establish not ephemeral but stable and long-term markets. We must now lay solid foundations for the time when the market conditions alter and we find ourselves in a much more highly competitive atmosphere.

I hope therefore that exporters will not merely stick to their old traditional markets—in some of which they may find it difficult to rebuild their former business, but will go out boldly to achieve new markets both as regards territories and classes of goods.

There are, however, still some goods of which the world supply is so inadequate to meet the demand that we must for a time continue a directional control on exports. The two principal ones are textiles and foodstuffs. So long as the present crucial shortage persists we cannot give freedom to the individual exporters as we have very definite obligations in these matters both to our own commonwealth and empire and to the world at large. We must therefore continue the war-time quota arrangements under which specific quantities are earmarked for particular markets. But even in these cases we are anxious, wherever it is at all possible to commit some quantities, however small, to be at the free disposition of the exporter to enable him to reopen particularly valuable markets and to maintain his connection with them. These quantities will we hope be increased progressively until the time comes when there will no longer be any need to control the exports at all.

We are very conscious of the need for this freedom and nothing but our deep obligations to those who have struggled with us in the war would cause us to maintain these hampering restrictions.

I would like, on this matter of the volume of our exports, to say a special word to those overseas buyers who are many of them impatiently waiting for the much greater and swifter flow of British exports which will be available in the future, but cannot be realised at the moment.

We value immensely their goodwill, we know their friendliness and we ask for their patient understanding of our present difficulties. We are making the most determined effort to

enable us to supply their needs at the earliest possible moment; our own people are sacrificing their comforts to that end, and it will not now be long, if the present signs can be relied upon, before they will again be able to buy British goods with comparative freedom. Even if we can at the moment only make token deliveries, they are tokens of our goodwill and of our desire for a rapidly expanding trade.

Let me now pass to what we are actually doing in the way of reconversion, especially in the export field. Our national desire to get on with the job makes us all impatient. Weeks seem like months or years while we wait to see the machines of peace working full speed again.

In present conditions the trade returns are not a good guide to the trend of exports. The figures for the last three months have been £39.4 million, £32.8 million, and £44.9 million. The reasons for the fluctuation are the reduction in the scope of export licensing the result of which may be about a week's delay in the production of documents to the customs, and the dock strike, one effect of which was to cause some duplication in the entries to the Customs owing to the goods not being shipped on the vessel originally intended.

In the circumstances, we must rely on the statistics of labour employed on exports, which show that we have progressed in a remarkable way. Already in September, labour employed on exports had increased by 50 per cent. over the previous June from 430,000 to 640,000 and that expansion is now proceeding rapidly. We hope that by June next we shall have more people employed on exports than in the pre-war years.

This does not of course mean that we shall have by then obtained a pre-war level of exports. Owing to the time taken in the production of goods it will not be before the end of next year that we may expect to reach it.

We have a great deal to do, I am certain, in the better organisation of our salesmanship in exports. The function of the Government here is to stimulate, encourage and assist with all its power. We cannot lay down a formula as to how different industries should proceed but we can lay down certain propositions which have a very wide application.

We must bring in everyone we can. The small firm, like the

big, must be harnessed to our export drive. There are many ways in which this can be done; one is by widespread sub-contracting. This was found during the war to be an excellent way of entraining a great variety of small firms in highly skilled work such as aircraft construction. There is no reason at all why it should not be used to expand the capacity of those firms who have more orders than they can themselves meet from their own unaided resources. Do let us remember that early deliveries may win markets that could be lost by delay and that it is vital to use every device to get the goods out. By proper inspection the manufacturer can protect himself completely against inferior quality, as we found with aircraft in the war.

Another method is by the co-operative grouping of manufacturers in some export organisation. This has already been done in some cases, thereby enabling them all to be adequately served in the export markets in a way that would be quite impossible for each one individually. We must have "combined operations" on this job. If we allow our particularity and individualism to prevent such co-operative working we shall never get the markets we must have. The merchants, too, can help greatly by studying the production processes and seeing that they so conduct their end of the business as to make the production as economic and competitive as possible.

I mention these only as examples of what may be done, but I do beg every export association in the country to get right down to the job and work out as rapidly as possible the best way they can of entraining every one of their members in this essential job. We will do all we can to help them.

So far as the Government activities are concerned, we are doing our utmost to assist exports. Raw materials we are making available even where the supply is difficult and we are seeking to ensure these are for exports rather than home consumption.

In considering the use to which we put the limited quantities of foreign exchange available for purchases from overseas countries of machinery and materials, we pay particular regard to the needs of export trade.

Labour supply and building labour have special preference

for export projects and we are assisting by getting key men out of the forces—when they really are key men.

I know there are still great difficulties with labour—that is the price, or one of the prices, of victory.

But that situation looks like easing at last. Don't forget the demobilised man and woman have fifty-six days' leave after they are demobilised, so that the post-VJ flow into industry has hardly started as yet. By the end of the year nearly four million men and women will have come out of the services and the munitions industries and that must make a vast difference to the labour situation. Already I am glad to see signs that the labour force in the Textile industries is beginning to grow slightly larger. I hope that with the Evershed Report and improving conditions it will not now be long before there is a really marked improvement.

Both the Foreign Secretary and I are convinced that we must do our utmost to provide a better Overseas Commercial Service, which can be at the disposal of industry. We want more and better instructed representatives abroad and the Consular Service can, I am sure, play a larger part in fostering our commercial interests abroad.

As a special measure to ensure as close a contact between my department and industry in this country, I am appointing export representatives in all the Regions so that manufacturers can contact the department and make use of its services without having to travel to London. We too shall benefit by these contacts which will give us a closer and more intimate knowledge of the problems.

Another factor which I regard as of the utmost importance is the personal contact between our exporters and the buyers in overseas countries. To this end we have done our best to improve travel conditions for our representatives and to encourage as many as possible to take advantage of them. I am glad to say that British representatives are now leaving this country at the rate of 1,600 a month, which is a good beginning but by no means sufficient.

We are sending certain specific Goodwill Trade Missions to certain countries—one for instance, leaves this week for Egypt—and this we propose to continue with, I hope, greater

THE TASK AHEAD

frequency. But this does not take the place of visits by specific industrial teams or representatives of firms or of export associations.

I want the manufacturers of this country to realise the urgent importance now of these visits just when international trade is opening up again. The fact that there is momentarily no great volume of export goods available is no reason for postponing the visits, indeed often it is a reason for expediting them.

We certainly must not be put off by the inconvenience and delays of travel in the difficult circumstances of to-day or even the dangers. We won our position in the world by facing those dangers and inconveniences and not by giving way to them.

You will be glad to hear that, in this matter, the Government is practising what it preaches. Our commercial representatives are continually being brought back from overseas for consultation and the exchange of information, and since VE Day a number of senior officers from Headquarters have been out to visit overseas territories. On the reverse side of the coin, we are, of course, anxious to welcome buyers from overseas to this country. Although we have not yet been able to make full arrangements for a more systematic reception of important buyers, we are attending to this as a matter of urgency and have already been able to do quite a lot in the way of turning on special facilities for missions and individual business men coming to this country.

One other aspect of this sales policy I would mention, and that is the very vital need for proper representation of our manufacturers in foreign markets. And I emphasise the word "proper." Too often in the past, we have been prepared—especially in the smaller actual markets though they may be potentially large—to leave that representation to some casual expert who really has little or no interest in pushing sales. In some cases indeed he may be the representative of our rivals and his main action is to see that we don't benefit at that rival's expense.

That is not the way to sell our goods. We must have first-class representatives who really understand the goods in which

they are dealing and who are kept well instructed in every necessary detail by our manufacturers here.

There is another aspect of salesmanship to which I attach a great importance, that is display or exhibition, the visual argument. I am doing my best to encourage sectional exhibitions by trade groups or associations and we are considering carefully the whole policy of Government-sponsored exhibitions at home and abroad. In the meanwhile, the Council of Industrial Design is organising an exhibition for next year to show our own country and the world what we can do in the manufacture of attractively designed goods of all kinds. This is really a vital exhibition for our export trade and one that I hope every individual here will do their best to encourage. We must put ourselves across and show the world that we are not an exhausted and war-worn country, but a vigorous and determined community confident of maintaining and improving upon our pre-war place in the world markets.

I have dealt with our immediate prospects and what action it is possible and necessary for us to take at once so that we may take advantage of the sellers' market of the next year or two. But we must look farther ahead than that, because however important the next two or three years may be, it is the long future beyond that which will be the testing time for our industries. We have perhaps two or three or possibly four years (though I doubt so long) ahead of us in which to put ourselves in condition to meet the competitive struggle which will then be upon us. We must co-operate to prepare for that time just as we co-operate to prepare for war, but do not let us wait this time until the necessity is upon us.

The fundamental need is, of course, the highest degree of efficiency in our production. No exporter can win markets unless quality, price and design enable him to sell the goods. As to quality, I am not anxious—we have won and hold our reputation for that ; as to design, I have already spoken. There remains price, and that is a measure of our efficiency. We cannot and must not try to attain low price by cutting wages, we must attain it by increased efficiency and cutting costs.

When I was in the Ministry of Aircraft Production, I found that a very great deal could be done by efficiency devices of all

kinds to save labour and so reduce cost. I had there, as part of the organisation, a Production Efficiency Board which did invaluable service and was much sought after by manufacturers for its advice. I am now considering, in association with industry, whether a similar service could be organised in association with the activities of the Board of Trade. This, however, is only one small contribution to a tremendous problem that must be tackled by industry itself. It is not a question of whether an industry is efficient or inefficient but of whether there is anything we can do to improve its efficiency—and there always is plenty to be done.

It is a curious but undeniable fact that the more efficient an industry is, the less it resents suggestion of improvement. It is those industries which are out of date in their machinery and ideas which are most touchy when it is suggested to them that there is still room for improvement. If we are going to reach the high point of efficiency necessary for export trade competition, we must be flexible-minded about it.

It is because we want to help all we can in this vital task that we have set up Working Parties to discover and decide how we can increase our competitive power in the world and give to our people the best at the lowest price. One such Party, as you know, is working here in Manchester under the able chairmanship of Sir George Schuster, and I hope every member of it, and all those who can and will help in its work, will do their utmost to make this co-operative undertaking the foundation for a flourishing cotton industry, which can face the world with that strength which comes from confidence in its own prowess.

Other industries are being similarly tackled and more will be undertaken in the New Year. We are thus, I hope, laying the foundation of a prosperity in years to come which will enable us to hold our own in the markets of the world and give leadership in the organisation of peace and plenty.

I would say one further word as to sales. We shall succeed in our efforts in proportion as we give good service to those who wish to buy from us. It is their needs, their opinions and their views which must be met and not our own preconceived notions of what they ought to be willing to buy. In the past, we have

DEMOCRACY ALIVE

too often taken the line that we know best and that our customers can take it or leave it. That will not do for the future. We must, by market and by operational research—on the lines of our war-time experience—discover and study the needs and tastes of our markets and how best to satisfy those demands. We hope that through the co-operation of such organisations as the Department of Overseas Trade section of the Board of Trade, the central research organisations like B.E.T.R.O. and the individual research groups and firms we shall be able to bring home to manufacturers this vital aspect of overseas sales.

I have, I fear, been overlong in my attempt to lay before you some of the principal aspects of our export problem, but I offer no excuse because of the vast importance of the problem to the whole future of our country. As during those six years of tragic suffering through which we have passed our unconquerable teamwork made the slogan "Britain can take it" ring through every country in the world, so let us, by maintaining that same spirit of common endeavour, convince all mankind that we have emerged from those trials stronger, more determined and better equipped to keep our place of leadership in a world of ever-advancing industrial achievement.

(B) TO THE UNIONS

*Lancashire and Cheshire T.C., Blackpool,
9th September, 1945.*

It is early perhaps after only six weeks in office to attempt to give any account of my stewardship as President of the Board of Trade, but the matters entrusted to my care are of such vital importance to our future and are so intimately the concern of Trade Unionists throughout the country that I am going to try and give you some indication of how the Government's policy is developing in the sphere of production and distribution, both external and internal.

I imagine that with the awakening shock of the sudden realisation that Lend Lease must inevitably come to an end when its purpose of victory has been accomplished, none of us are

any longer unaware of the extreme difficulties that confront our nation.

During the course of the election campaign, in which Trade Unionists played so magnificent and victorious a part, I went out of my way over and over again to stress the seriousness of the situation of this country in the post-war epoch that we were then entering.

The difficulties that we now face can be expressed very simply. By force of circumstances we have thrown everything : our wealth, our energy, our factories and our homes into the battle for liberty. And now that the battle is over and won, we find ourselves with an economy out of adjustment for our peace-time needs. We willingly and advisedly destroyed that peace-time economy to play our full part in the war. The measure to which we carried this destruction can be illustrated well by comparative figures. We all know to what an extent our friends in the U.S.A. made sacrifices for the same purpose and yet the consumption per head of our civilian population in this country in 1944 was 15-20 per cent. below 1939, whereas in the United States of America it was 10-15 per cent. above that of 1939.

Not only are we short of every kind of civilian supply for the home market, just at the moment when there is a more pressing and urgent demand for them than ever before, but we are also unable to export the often similar goods needed all over the world—exports without which we cannot import the foods and raw materials that are vital to our existence.

We certainly have the skill and capacity to produce the things we need, but we have so disrupted our whole peace-time economy over the last six years and so destroyed our export markets that it must take time, and a very considerable time, before we can reconstitute our peace-time industrial production.

And during these three, four or five years when we shall be building up our civilian industries we must live and we must be able to import certain essential goods required for the building up of our industries.

It might perhaps appear to be a simple remedy to borrow freely from others and so finance all the imports we require. But we must look farther ahead than that.

We are already heavily indebted to many countries who supplied us with essential goods during the war for sterling, and we have not been able to discharge these sterling debts because we had no surplus from our war effort to export.

Even if some arrangement can be made, as has been suggested, to reduce or fund that indebtedness it will still mean a heavy load of demand upon our exports, not to bring in fresh imports but to pay for what we have already consumed in holding the fort of freedom and ultimately in playing our part in the victory over the enemy.

If now we were, in addition, to enter into large fresh indebtedness abroad in order to save ourselves from our war-created embarrassment and difficulties we should be assuming an impossible burden which we should have to discharge in the future in the form of interest payments and repayment of capital. This could only be done by the export of vast quantities of goods to those countries to whom we were indebted and from whom we should get nothing in return—for we should be paying off past debts. Even if those countries were prepared to admit the necessary exports, the depletion of our own resources would lead to a lowering of our standard of living and to an eventual failure on our part, with all the tragedy of ill-will and misunderstanding which such a state of affairs necessarily brings.

We certainly do not want to assume obligations which we know that we cannot discharge.

So we must turn not to the easy and extravagant way of excessive borrowings to help us, but to the much harder but more honest and self-reliant way of working out our own salvation as far as in us lies.

As a great nation of exporters in the past, anxious to recover our overseas markets so that we may contribute to the utmost to the raising of the standard of living throughout the world, we shall of course welcome any practicable means by which the trade channels of the world can be made free for the flow of international trade. We desire to co-operate with the other countries of the world in every way that is possible to achieve the highly desirable—indeed necessary—aim of an expansionist world economy. But in this co-operation our friends in other countries must realise our especially difficult situation in these

immediate post-war years. These years of transition from a war-time to a peace-time economy have their special problems which demand special methods to deal with them. Once that transition is accomplished it will be far easier for us to adopt a common attitude to problems which will be common to ourselves and others.

What we ourselves now have to concentrate upon is the reconversion of our industrial and commercial life to the requirements of peace, so that we can emerge from this transition—not an exhausted and bankrupt nation, but rather a strong and active partner in the establishment of the sort of world organisation for peace and security which has been envisaged in the San Francisco Conference.

To do this we must set to with every available effort to increase our production of civilian goods for our home and export markets, and during this period of rebuilding we must recognise that we cannot have all we would like for our own consumption at the same time as we build up our export trade. I want to give the greatest emphasis to that simple fact, because in the months and years that lie ahead of us, it is going to be difficult for our people to realise that by forgoing the immediate advantages of a bigger home market and so a higher standard of consumption, they are in fact making sure of better and far more stable standards in the future, when we have won through the transition.

It obviously seems reasonable for instance that our people to-day should demand and expect more foods, furniture, clothing and household commodities of all kinds. No people in the world have done more to deserve those better standards of comfort, but I ask them to remember that the price of that increase of supplies to the home market would be our inability to maintain even the present inadequate volume of exports, and so the loss of even more of our foreign markets. This would lead to a failure of imports in the future with lowered standards for us all, or else the piling up of a foreign indebtedness which we could not discharge and which would hopelessly defer, and indeed destroy, the possibility of an eventual recovery. The dress the mother goes without this year is helping to make sure that her children will get what they need in the years to

come. Instead of wasting our resources as the bankrupt does on the eve of his bankruptcy, we must preserve our resources until we are through our difficulties.

Now this statement of our present economic situation is but a prelude to the description of the task that we have to tackle. It is the setting in which your and my work will be for the next few years.

It is obvious that we must do our best to increase our exports, especially to those markets where we hope to establish or re-establish ourselves upon a permanent basis, while at the same time we strive to improve gradually the volume of supplies available for the home market.

Exports cannot, of course, have an absolute first priority, that would mean starvation and misery for our own people. But having decided upon the standards which we at the moment can afford at home we must then concentrate upon selling all we can abroad. This relates not only to consumer goods, but to machinery and other capital goods as well. There is a massive world-wide demand for capital goods of all kinds, but we must be careful that we do not deprive ourselves of those capital goods that are essential to our own reconversion of industry.

You will see, therefore, that there is a nice balance to be struck, not only between home and export markets but also between different export markets, so as to preserve our goodwill and to lay the foundations for those stable future foreign markets which will survive after the first post-war scramble for goods has died down. This latter is not so easy as might appear. So many countries are to-day in as difficult a position as our own. They have no exports available but they urgently need imports to restart their economy. They can thus trade only upon the basis of credits, but in our present situation it is difficult for us to give credits because we ourselves urgently need imports in exchange for our exports.

But though the dividing up of our cake is important, what is even more important is to make the biggest cake we can so that everyone's share is greater.

It is in this task of getting the greatest possible production from our resources of manpower and materials that I want to

enlist your aid. I will tell you first what I think needs to be done and then how we propose to set about doing it.

So far as my department is concerned I shall be dealing substantially with that part of our production which will remain for the time being under private enterprise. The great industries like coal, iron and steel and transport that were designated as fit for immediate nationalisation in our election programme, do not fall within my province. We have therefore, so far as the major part of our industrial production is concerned, to work on under existing conditions of private ownership. That does not, of course, mean that there is nothing to be done. As with the cotton industry, we must determine what is required from a national point of view and then see to it that by one means or another those necessary improvements are brought about.

British industry is undoubtedly suffering from the drawbacks of the pioneer, and from other factors too. The first in the field, with unlimited prospects of expansion for a great many years, industry devoted itself to continuing to produce without paying sufficient attention to the gradually increasing competition from other countries. So, particularly in the older industries, we tended to become more and more out of date and instead of relying upon that inventiveness and enterprise which started us on the road of industrial development, we tended to look more and more for Governmental aid by taxation or tariffs, by subsidy or regulation to cure defects ; these expedients, though they might bring a temporary relief, in the ultimate result merely cloaked the underlying cause of our difficulties. Manufacturers were obsessed by the theory that private enterprise should be left to its own devices until it called in the Government to assist it. This may have been an adequate method during the period of great expansion in the latter part of the last century, but the facts of the situation during this century have abundantly proved its inadequacy. The Government not only can but has the obligation to see to it that the conditions of our industries are such as to serve the community efficiently and to give them a fair chance in the markets of the world.

In the result, even before the war many of our industries

were hopelessly behind their overseas rivals, and that position has during six years of war grown steadily worse—with the exception of the engineering industry which the Government did so much to develop during the war.

Now this static state of inefficiency has repercussions upon the whole nation and particularly upon the workers.

They become frustrated because it stabilises their wages at a low level, they lose interest in the national aspect of our production and tend to concentrate their energies upon an effort to improve their own particular conditions, an effort which is itself frustrated by the inefficiency of production methods and organisation in the industry itself.

This leads to clashes between employers and employees, to strikes and ill feeling which still further decreases our industrial efficiency. The employers then say they cannot afford to improve their buildings and machinery and so we get into a vicious circle.

As I have pointed out, from a national point of view it is imperative that that circle should be broken and it is for the Government representing the interests of all the people to see that it is broken, and broken quickly. We have stated that provided industries will take all the necessary steps for their own reorganisation we will help them to win through to real efficiency.

Having spoken so much of efficiency and inefficiency, let me give you an indication of what I mean by that word.

First for a negative definition. I do not mean sweating and driving the workers to strain for long hours at inadequate wages and under bad conditions. That is the exact opposite of efficiency.

I mean rather the treating of conditions in our industries both as regards buildings, machinery, hours, wages and amenities which will give the workers the best opportunity to produce the maximum amount of goods in a given time with the least expenditure of energy. That is real efficiency and it implies that we must have first class, well trained and highly skilled managements.

Management is not a casual occupation which any Tom, Dick or Harry is fit for, it is a highly skilled profession—or rather it ought to be—which cannot be entered upon by anyone

THE TASK AHEAD

without proper qualifications, the most important of which is perhaps a thorough apprenticeship in the industry itself.

But there is more than that in efficiency. It also entails taking advantage of and applying the latest results of scientific and technical research. Industry is bound to become static if it is out of touch with research, which should not be regarded merely as a good advertising point, but rather as the very foundation for a live and dynamic production, which must always be early in the market with the newest goods and the newest processes.

A mass of most valuable industrial and fundamental research is carried out in this country but all too often it fails to penetrate the over-conservative ranks of the industrialists. The monopoly instinct, too, is so strong that industry as a whole is deprived of the advantages of much individual discovery.

So efficiency implies not only a proper volume of research but the means of applying that research to our production processes throughout industry, large and small firms alike.

Finally, there is the third element in efficient production. Goods are sold in the market not only upon their material quality and cost, but upon their appearance too. Far too little attention has been given in the past to the design aspect of our manufacturer. Some of you may have read an article the other Sunday by Sir William Crawford, upon this aspect of our Foreign Trade, in which he pointed out the results of a questionnaire which had been circulated in many countries abroad. The one quite uniform answer as to what disadvantages British goods suffered from in the competitive market was that they were inferior in design.

This we can and must remedy. We have a tradition of British design to which the whole world has looked up in the past and there is no reason whatever why we should not resume a position of leadership in design. But to-day our manufacturers are neglecting that aspect of efficiency and are treating overseas buyers as if it were an unreasonable crankiness to demand outstanding design. We cannot afford as a nation to allow our industries to adopt the old "take it or leave it" line. We have got to go out to get markets and to make sales and we must see that our products are reasonably competitive in every way. It is for this reason that the Council of Industrial Design has

been set up and financed by the Government and it must be given every encouragement and help to do what is an absolutely vital job—make our manufacturers design conscious.

Let me now turn to the methods that we propose to adopt to encourage and stimulate efficiency in all its forms—suitable conditions to produce the best from the workers with the least effort, sound and applied research, and good design.

We desire to deal with all these problems upon the basis of a tripartite partnership—employers, employees and the Government. In that partnership it will be the duty of the Government to emphasise at all times the national as distinct from the sectional interest, and the consumer rather than the producer needs.

We must proceed in an organised way to achieve this partnership. In the first instance we must ascertain exactly what it is that is needed in the different industries to create this all-round efficiency. Here obviously the two sides of the industry can speak from the most intimate knowledge and in many cases two different plans or more have already been published, but these plans, coming from the employers and employees, vary very much in approach and in the suggestions which they make.

We propose therefore to set up working Parties in the different industries to review all the material and formulate a plan for action, the more urgent taking priority. Each Party will consist of three equal parts, representative of employers, of Trade Unions and of the general public interest. The first and second sections will be chosen from a list of nominations by the Employers' and Trade Union organisations respectively, the third section, together with a chairman, will be chosen by myself. A secretary will be supplied from my Department. These groups will be able to appoint such technical working parties as they wish to deal with detail and will be expected to report at the earliest possible moment. I shall ask them to deal with the matter as one of extreme urgency and I shall expect them to sit more or less continuously until their job is completed.

This is the broad scheme that the Board of Trade propose to adopt, not rigid in its details, for it must be adapted to the

THE TASK AHEAD

peculiar circumstances of each industry. This does not mean, of course, that other methods of inquiry may not be adopted where these are required or that different methods may not be applied in such special industries as engineering. This is only a general picture of the way in which the Board of Trade proposes to proceed. In this scheme, as you will see, a very great and important part will be played by Trade Unionists, both as representing Trade Unions and in some cases as independent chairmen or members dealing with industries other than that in which they are themselves directly engaged.

I know that you will readily appreciate that such an opportunity will demand the widest industrial statesmanship. It would be fatal if those charged with these responsibilities were to enter upon their task in any narrow spirit of sectional advantage. One overriding objective is to get a plan in the National interest, having regard to the needs of the consumer at home, the exporter and the producer. More and more the Trade Unions have been claiming and taking their positions as partners in the formulation of industrial policy and this new step towards industrial organisation will establish their equal responsibility, but that responsibility will not merely be towards their own members, but to the whole nation as well. Their vision will spread not only over the field of wages and conditions but into all the complex of efficiency of production, including the area of research and design. It must also take in the question of markets and of consumer interest.

It will, of course, be of the utmost importance for the future of our industry that the personnel for these Commissions are chosen wisely. So far as the Trade Union representatives are concerned the whole reputation of the Trade Union movement will be at stake as well as our own industrial future. By their reports these Commissions can go far to make or mar our future, and I therefore trust that when I ask for the nominations, and I shall hope to start in a very short time, the greatest care and trouble will be taken to nominate live, intelligent, forward-looking representatives.

With this assured participation in the formulation of policy will go the need to make certain that we do not waste our resources in unnecessary delays due to disputes or to lack of

concentration upon the job in hand. Our object, as I have said, is to create the best conditions in which the worker can produce with the least effort. If we can accomplish that and indeed while we are working towards its accomplishment there will be an obligation upon the workers to give of their best—not for the sake of the owners' profits but for the sake of our national economic survival and prosperity.

During the war we did develop in this country—under the stress of a common danger—a great comradeship of action. The workers have in this last election, for the first time in our history, taken political power into their hands, and with it they have assumed the gravest responsibility to our people. We must not let that community of action disappear, nor must the workers destroy their political power through their failure to appreciate its responsibilities, or their lack of statesmanship in action.

No Government using democratic methods—and we are determined to use such methods, having been given the power to do so—can accomplish great changes in a few months. In these most difficult of times, with shortage of staffs, with all the crowding problems of demobilisation and reconversion, and with the avalanche of international questions which demand immediate attention, it is even harder to bring about the industrial changes we desire with the speed we should like.

We must then ask our supporters not only to show a patient appreciation of our difficulties but also in their solution to give us their whole-hearted support both in thought and action. It is a time for concentrated team work.

In that way we shall be able to achieve a more rapid increase in efficient production, and it is efficient production alone that can set us once more upon our civilian legs and so open up the prospect of that advance in standards which is the prime object of our policies.

I would emphasise once more that we are not on the eve of entering a Utopia where all is ease and prosperity. Whatever else the election of a Labour Government has accomplished, it has not brought Utopia to our doors !

We are in the most difficult economic circumstances that our country has ever encountered and we are determined to

win out of these circumstances better standards for our people. But this can only be done if every one of us puts his whole energy and effort into his job. There is no short cut—hard work and hard work alone can win us the prize of success and with that success continued power to progress to further heights.

Behind and beyond all these mechanics of a more efficient production lies something much greater and more magnetic in its attraction to our efforts. The prime principle of the Socialism for which we stand lies not in the methods of organisation of our society that we adopt but in the high purpose at which we aim.

We have had, over the last century of our civilisation, most bitter experiences of the impact of a self-seeking materialism upon the peoples of the world. This reached its climax in the Nazi and Fascist aggression for which the world and our own country have paid so dearly during six years of agonising struggle. We Socialists see something higher in humanity than the robot-like qualities which were so often regarded as the sole attribute of the workers in the past. We know and regard them as human beings whose qualities we recognise in ourselves, some better, some worse, but all capable, as the war has proved once again, of the greatest heights of devotion and self-sacrifice, of love and kindness, of what we might summarise—in the true biblical meaning of that word—as charity.

It is these high qualities that we seek to encourage and for which we wish to create the opportunity of expression.

I have myself always regarded Socialism and Christianity as synonymous, and I am convinced that all we are seeking to do by way of organisation and planning must be carried out—if we are to succeed—in the light and under the guidance of our Socialist and Christian principles. We want more than a mechanism for social advancement, we must create a great spirit of human values, selfless and self-sacrificing in the cause of long-suffering humanity.

I have pictured to you our difficulties. I have described the steps we propose to take in one particular and important field to overcome them, and it is in the spirit of Christian devotion and Socialist determination that I ask you to give us your wholehearted support.

(C) WORKING PARTIES

House of Commons, 15th October, 1945.

I would like, with permission, to give the House an explanation of the Government's policy of inquiring into the efficiency of our industries by the method of tripartite working parties, and some account of the progress that has been made with the cotton, pottery, hosiery, furniture, and boot and shoe industries. I have explained to these industries that, while for a year or two they and other British industries will have no difficulty in selling abroad all they can produce, the special advantage of a seller's market in a period of world shortage will end and a time will come when it will be difficult to find and keep all the markets that we need. We cannot wait until these difficulties are upon us ; we must forestall them if we are to be able to cope with them when they arrive. We cannot, therefore, neglect any steps which on the one hand will make our industries more competitive in the markets of the world, and on the other will provide us at home with the best goods at the cheapest price consistent with good conditions for those in the industry. The Government must in one way or another get the best advice it can on what these steps should be. Three conditions are essential ; firstly, advice must come from industry itself because that is where all the past experience resides ; secondly, employers and workers should be equally represented because both sides not only have a contribution to make but also will have to carry out any plans that may be decided upon ; and thirdly, the public and Parliament must be satisfied—whatever the recommendations may be—that they are truly in the national interest and that the two sides of industry have not “ganged up” against the consumer for their own advantage. The Government have decided that these three conditions can best be fulfilled by establishing tripartite working parties composed in equal thirds of representatives of employers and workers and of independent members and consisting of persons who will be accepted nationally as an authoritative body.

I am happy to inform the House that I have received the most cordial co-operation from both sides of industry and that

the task of setting up working parties for the five industries I have mentioned is now practically completed. I will not go into detail on the composition of these working parties which will be found in the statement that is being circulated in the official report, but two points I would like to mention. The first is that we have been fortunate in securing as Chairmen of the working parties : Sir George Schuster, Sir Archibald Forbes, Miss Caroline Haslett, Mr. T. P. Bennett and Mr. Andrew Dalglish. Secondly, there has been a remarkable response from the score or so of engineers, scientists, economists and other persons of standing, who, like the Chairmen, have without hesitation agreed to help as independent members, with all the consequent disturbance of their busy lives.

The terms of reference of all these working parties are in common form as follows :—

“To examine and inquire into the various schemes and suggestions put forward for improvements of organisation, production and distribution methods and processes in the industry, and to report as to the steps which should be taken in the national interest to strengthen the industry and render it more stable and more capable of meeting competition in the home and foreign markets.”

These terms of reference are wide enough to cover any question of industrial efficiency, but I have made it clear to the Chairmen that matters concerning relations between employers and employees, which are dealt with by employers' federations and trade unions, should be considered outside the scope of their inquiries. The point is not mentioned in the terms of reference, but I have told each Chairman that he, himself, and the independent members should have particular regard to the broad national interest involved and to the interest of the consumers. The Chairman, with the consent of his working party, will be at liberty to set up any sub-groups that he considers necessary for examining particular aspects of the problem and to co-opt on to them any person he considers advisable. I have also said that interim reports should be made upon matters of special urgency and, while undue hurry must not be allowed to spoil the value of the reports, they should

be presented as soon as possible. I would hope to get the final reports early in the New Year. These will be published.

The House will appreciate that this is only a beginning and that there will be a number more of such inquiries.

(D) THE LOCATION OF INDUSTRY

*National Union of Manufacturers,
15th November, 1945.*

I should like to take this opportunity to say a few words to you on the subject of the distribution of our industries in this country.

The broad principle which lies behind the Government's policy in this matter is that we should take the work to the people and not the people to the work. That is to say, wherever we have the houses, the schools, the churches, the places of entertainment and so on, we should see that we have located there too a sufficiency of industrial buildings of reasonable diversity to give continual employment.

During the last century our industries have been allowed to grow up sometimes through geographical necessity, sometimes by accident of choice in such a way that many of the most dense industrial areas were one-industry areas. It was this fact that led to the great pockets of unemployment and distress during the inter-war years. The coal-mining areas of Durham, Lanarkshire and South Wales were terrible examples. The coal-mining areas of West Riding and Lancashire, the ship-building areas of the North-east Coast and Clydeside were almost equally bad, and in some of the cotton towns of Lancashire and in the Potteries, conditions were very difficult.

Now it is that state of affairs that everyone is determined to avoid in the future. But we can only avoid a recurrence by wise action and not by talk or charity.

We have to send into those so-called development areas a great number of light industries of all kinds to match the heavy work that is already carried on there. Particularly must we find employment for the womenfolk of those districts

a great many of whom have become most skilled operatives during the war.

There are two other factors in this distribution of industry which are of importance.

We discovered during the war over-heavy concentration of industries in confined districts within London. Not only is this strategically dangerous, but it gives rise to great difficulties over labour supply, and involves work-people travelling long distances to their jobs. We don't want to repeat that folly.


The second point is the practical one of building. Building labour is not evenly distributed over the country. It tends to be in better supply in some areas than in others, though overall there is of course not enough for all we want it for. But this makes it easier to build in the development areas and makes it necessary *not* to build in places like London—especially where there are already hundreds of factories needing blitz repair, which has not yet been begun because of the essential priority which was given to houses before the winter set in.

You will therefore see that there are a number of quite unanswerable arguments as to why we cannot allow new industries or factories in and around London and why indeed we are able to promise an earlier start to those industrialists who decide to set up factories in those parts of the country which are in need of new employment.

Fortunately the dispersal policy of the war and the Government building programme was embarked upon with one eye on the future, so that many of the Government factories built during the war are well situated to disperse industries out of the already overcrowded centres.

These areas are being opened up as industrial centres and we shall be undertaking a regular planned programme to improve all the facilities of those areas as regards transport services, etc. Already many firms have gone to these areas and are very pleased with the first-class new accommodation they have found and with the supply of labour that is readily available.

We are now building further standard factories upon all the many trading estates that have been started up to provide the accommodation that is being sought after. At the same time, we are rapidly handing over Government factories for peace-time use.



IV.

THE TEAM

(A) THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

*To the Staff of the Board of Trade,
29th August, 1945.*

I HAVE ASKED you all to come here this afternoon as there was no other way in which I, the Parliamentary Secretary, the Secretary of the Department of Overseas Trade, the Permanent Secretary of the Department, and others who work closely with us, could meet you face to face. At least it gives us all the chance to see what the others look like !

One of the great troubles of a large administrative Department like our own is that there are so many of us that we cannot all get to know each other and consequently it is much more difficult for us to realise that we are all—each one of us, however exalted or humble our position may be—members of a team, and that it is our joint effort alone that can bring that team the success which we all desire.

This afternoon I want to try and give you all an insight into our objectives and into my ideas of how we should set about to attain those objectives.

I am convinced that no one can give of their best to the country—and that is our aim—unless they understand the importance and value of their work.

So let me first say a word or two about the general setting in which our work lies.

We have just emerged from a long period of war in which the activities of the Board of Trade had to take second place to that of the Supply departments and, of course, to the Services too.

DEMOCRACY ALIVE

That does not mean that the multifarious work in which you have been engaged was unimportant. Far from it, but it does mean that you have had to struggle through with it under most difficult circumstances of staff and accommodation. You have had to manage often with less than a bare minimum and I should like to congratulate all of you upon the way you have managed to keep the job going during these difficult years of war.

But now that period has passed and the Board of Trade work has become of the most urgent priority and must be extended greatly in its scope.

In fact—in a sense which I will shortly explain—we have become the Civilian Supply Department, and all our national energies must now be devoted to that branch of our affairs both for our domestic purposes and for exports.

The termination of Lend Lease, of which we have read so much, and what is even more difficult, the balancing of our economy during the next three to five years, demands of this country an effort in production and in planning such as it has never known before.

During the war we have, ever since 1941, had the cushion of Lend Lease upon which we could fall back. If the worst came to the worst we could always call upon our generous American allies to help us out with raw materials, foodstuffs, or manufactured articles.

That enabled us to do what otherwise would have been quite impossible, turn ourselves into a veritable arsenal for the United Nations—an arsenal and an advanced base of manufacture. We could devote all our energies to that purpose because we had the security of Lease Lend behind us. As you know, that enabled us during 1944 to concentrate all our energies upon the final victory, cutting down every other activity to the barest minimum.

Now the cushion has been removed and we must somehow or other over the next few years bring our economy to a balance by creating a sufficient export of goods to enable us to get in exchange the raw materials and foodstuffs without which we cannot live.

Then also during the war we have piled up great debts

THE TEAM

to suppliers like India and the South American countries, and they will want us to send them goods to start paying off some of that indebtedness.

We must, too, for the same reason, cut down every unnecessary import so as to leave as small an adverse balance as possible internationally against our country.

But at the same time we have got other most important obligations. The people of this country are understandably tired of wartime restrictions, they want more of everything—food, clothes, furniture, household goods of all kinds, and of houses, schools, factories, offices and every other kind of building.

So, as a country, we have an immense and almost overwhelming job to produce all that is necessary to set us on our legs again in the field of international trade and to raise the very low standards of consumption to which we ourselves have been reduced.

The responsibility for seeing that that is done is ours—yours and mine—in the Board of Trade.

We can save or wreck our country by what we do and how we do it over the next few years.

There could be no finer and more inspiring objective for anyone who wants to help their country, as I know every one of us does.

Now how are we going to set out to do it. There has not, of course, been time as yet to work out all the details of our plans, but let me give you the broad lines of our approach to the problem.

We shall be dealing with all the private enterprise industries of this country—except the engineering industry, which will be the special care of the Ministry of Supply and Aircraft Production—and it will be our job to stimulate them to produce by the most efficient means possible the greatest possible volume of high quality goods—well manufactured and well designed—having regard to the labour force which we can spare them.

Then, too, we have to look after those difficult questions of distribution both in the wholesale, export and retail spheres which are important factors in our economic life.

If we can do our job well there should be no question of unemployment, indeed there will for many years to come be

a shortage of labour and we shall have to see that it is not wasted or used up on the wrong things.

Our first aim is to increase the most profitable exports and at the same time get more of the necessities of life—not luxuries—for our own people.

We shall try to do that by an effective tripartite co-operation in the various industries, employers, employees and ourselves working together to the common end of the greatest efficiency. A very important part of that efficiency being good wages and working conditions for the staffs and workers of our industries.

So here is a new job for the Board of Trade. As I said a little time ago, we shall be a sort of Civilian Supply Department and we must take as close and as intimate an interest in the production methods and efficiency of industry as have the Supply Departments during the war.

That very large new job and the stimulation of the export markets will be our two great positive and constructive tasks. We shall, of course, have to continue with all our regulatory work and we shall be taking over most of the Raw Material controls to help us direct and plan the proper flow of productive effort in the country.

There are many other activities in which we must continue to engage—each one with its own importance and absolutely necessary for the welfare of our country, but we shall try and fit them all into this general picture of planning and stimulating the productive power of our people.

I now want to say a word to you on our own domestic problems within the Department.

First comes the need for a reorganisation of the Department to cope with these new functions. The Permanent Secretary and his colleagues have worked out an excellent new basis of organising our work and that will be put into force at once. It is aimed at rearranging sections so that we get a more co-ordinated effort upon those functions which have now become so all-important—our constructive work of planning and supervising industrial production.

But organisation charts do not get one anywhere unless there is the staff to man up all the various sections of the Department.

THE TEAM

Here, as you know, we are in great difficulty through shortage of staff—and, unfortunately, just at the most critical time when we need to go ahead at maximum speed with our essential work.

You have all done a first-class job during the hard and difficult years of war, and some of you, many of you are, I have no doubt, feeling the strain of those years.

I am myself a believer in reasonable hours and good accommodation and conditions for any staff, but above all for Government staffs whose conditions of work ought to be an example to all other employers. I shall certainly aim at shortening hours and improving conditions as soon as ever that is possible, but at the moment nothing effective can be done till we get more staff and more accommodation.

Now so far I have spoken to you as if you had all been members of the Board of Trade staff during the war, but there are many here who have been working in the Ministry of Production, that fine co-ordinating Department which did so much to help the smooth flow of war-time production and to co-ordinate both the demands and supplies amongst all the United Nations.

That job has largely come to an end, though we hope that we may be able to use the war-time techniques of co-operative action to build up a degree of economic co-operation in the Peace. In that work your war-time experience will be invaluable, as too, will your production experience in the new job that the Board of Trade has to face.

You will, most of you I hope, be coming into the Board of Trade where I am sure you will be welcomed by your new colleagues and where I know you will make as distinguished a contribution to our administration as have those whom you will be joining.

I now come to what is perhaps the most important part of what I want to say to you, and that is how we should, as individuals, approach the job we are asked to do for our country.

Let us remember that an organisation like the Board of Trade is one whole complete entity. There is no individual in it—or there should not be—who is not absolutely necessary for the proper functioning of the whole.

The office cleaner, and the President, are both necessary though performing different functions; the typist and the clerk, the secretary and the Principal Assistant Secretary, the messenger and the Regional Controller, each one in his own way, fills a position without which the complete team could not satisfactorily do its job.

So do not let any one of us despise the work that any other one does, nor, most importantly, the work we do ourselves. And let us realise and respect the human being in all those with whom we work.

The essence of good team work is not only the co-ordination of the things we do, but also of the personalities that we are. The one intolerable element in any team is the individual who considers him or herself superior to his or her subordinates.

Now this appreciation of one another's personality must bring in its train certain consequences.

It means that we do not resent and are not hurt by constructive criticism of our work, indeed it is the task of those with greater experience to teach those with less experience by a constructive criticism of their work. But constructive criticism does not mean, of course, the damping down of initiative.

One of the justifiable criticisms of our great service—and there is no greater service in the world than the British Civil Service—is the tendency to suppress initiative with the consequence that decision is delayed and those at the top are overburdened with papers and with the need to decide matters with which they should never be troubled.

There are two reasons for this, one is our system of democracy as exemplified in the Parliamentary Question. There looms over the head of every civil servant the possibility of a Parliamentary Question as to the subject with which he is dealing and with that great loyalty that distinguishes our civil service he does not want to risk letting his side down. He may, therefore, hesitate to take a decision if he can pass it on to someone else. That is an excellent spirit but it is bad administration.

The second reason is the need for a rigid control of expenditure. We know from our experience that this is apt to be hamper-

THE TEAM

ing and annoying especially in the smaller matters. It is often said that it's easy to get permission to spend ten million pounds but difficult to get leave to spend sixpence.

But it is not necessary, I am sure, to stress the need for economy in administration, not cheese-paring economy but wise economy, which is the effort to get the best results out of the least extravagant expenditure.

But even here there are, I am sure, ways in which we can diminish both the delays and the complexities of our work and I am sure that our Accounting Officer will bear this in mind because I know he is as keen as I am upon smooth and rapid action. Fortunately, perhaps, we are not a great spending Department since most of our work is helping and stimulating others and not doing things which entail expenditure directly ourselves.

I want to make it quite clear that I regard the making of an occasional mistake as an essential element of any human administration.

I am perfectly conscious that I shall make them myself and I know that others will, but no mistake could be worse than the failure to make decisions. I am not asking you all rashly to set out to decide every point that comes to you regardless of how you do it, but what I am asking is that you should, each one of you, accept to the full the responsibility which you have. And I would ask all the senior members of the staff to do their utmost to delegate their responsibility as far as possible and if mistakes are made by their subordinates to deal with them as a necessary concomitant of the quick and expeditious discharge of business. I shall certainly, myself, adopt that attitude and I shall expect others to do the same.

Nothing must be held up for lack of quick decision. And here let me add a word about the unavoidable absence, through illness or leave, of members of the staff. Nothing must be delayed on such occasions, whoever is away, from the President downwards, the rest must see that the work goes on and is not interfered with by the absence.

During these coming months and years the future of our country will largely depend upon the speed and efficiency with which we can direct and plan our industrial production.

DEMOCRACY ALIVE

Do not let it be said or even suggested that any failure was due to our red-tapism or our failure to act when action was necessary.

I want also to stress the very great importance in an organisation like ours of placing round pegs in round holes. Two very potent reasons for inefficiency in any organisation arise from misfits. Those who are given a job which is too big for them, and those who have a job which is too small for them. Both conditions produce frustration and irritation and spoil the team spirit. I hope that our staffing conditions will be such that we shall be flexible in adjustment of the job to the personality. If people feel they are in the wrong job—after giving it a fair trial and attempting fully to understand it—they should apply for a transfer and we should do our best to find them a post in which they are in a more congenial environment.

The next point I want to deal with is the question of paper.

I have adopted the practice personally of always writing my own minutes. I apologise to those who have read them and find it difficult, but I find that if I write them myself I strictly limit the amount I write. The temptation of dictation is immensely great and if you are to dictate your minutes please bear in mind not only your own pleasure in composing a perfect literary work, but also the job your colleagues will have in reading it.

Minutes—and indeed all documents—should be kept snappy and simple. If a longer explanation is required it can always be asked for and given—if necessary—orally. Do all the business you can on the telephone or by a talk and keep the written word to the barest minimum possible. That will greatly help the speed of work and also will relieve the very hard-worked typist and registry staff. Very often a point can be cleared in a minute over the telephone which will take a week if minutes start passing.

In this relation I would point out the need for all of us to know who is the right individual to deal with any particular matter. Days can be lost by sending files to the wrong destination. Some matters must, of course, be minuted but a great deal that is put on the files to-day might equally well be disposed of by a word over the telephone.

THE TEAM

Finally, I come to our relations with the public, and this is a matter of which I cannot over-stress the importance.

Please get it firmly in your heads that our function is to serve the public and not to boss it. We may have to be tough at times with individuals or with particular organisations or bodies of individuals, and if it is necessary in our service of the public so to do, we shall not hesitate in doing our duty.

But of the public as a whole we are the servants, they have given us the job to do certain things for them and we must, therefore, in our relations with them do our best to serve them in the way they want.

Sometimes it is a trouble, they are persistent about things which seem to us of little importance, but we must be patient and above all, always courteous.

I am anxious that the Board of Trade should be regarded not only as the best and most efficient Department in Whitehall, but also as the friend and helper of the public.

Let us get away entirely from the chilly formalities of the old style correspondence which seems to come from some granitic monolith rather than from another human being. To write to some worried mother—"Madam, I am directed by the President of the Board of Trade to inform you" is to strike a chill of revulsion into her troubled heart, whereas "Dear Mrs. Jones, I am so sorry to hear of your trouble, etc." brings a warm feeling of human contact which can stand up against even the most blank refusal.

The way in which we receive callers, how long they are kept waiting, whether we get up to meet them at the door, these and a hundred other of the smallest matters and actions are what condition our relations with the public.

I am not, of course, suggesting that the Board of Trade is an inhuman machine at present, nothing of the sort, but I do want to emphasise to each individual amongst you that the way you as an individual deal with the public will influence the reputation of our team and the esteem or lack of esteem in which we are held by the public.

I may remind you that security excuses for the non-disclosure of unpalatable facts have almost entirely disappeared and that we shall advantage our own position and make our

job easier if we are frank and forthcoming as to what we are doing and what we intend to do.

This need to be more forthcoming with the public means, of course, that we must ourselves be better informed upon the work of our own department and of its interlinkage with the work of other Government departments and with industry.

I know personally how difficult this is, even when one has access to all documents and many wise counsellors who are always ready to instruct one. But we must try first to be completely well informed about the whole job of our section—its objectives and policy, and then to have at least a smattering of appreciation of the work of the rest of the Department.

I should like to suggest that for this purpose we have a series of talks throughout the winter by various heads of sections, who can explain to us exactly the functions and objectives of their work, as well as some on wider grounds by such past-masters in the art of administration as our own Permanent Secretary.

I have dealt with a number of matters this afternoon, not with a view to giving you a complete conspectus of all the duties and obligations of a civil servant in the Board of Trade, but rather in the attempt to paint a broad picture of the way in which I should like to see our team working. We aim at forging a living team conscious alike of the human personalities that go to form it and of the humanity we seek to serve. The machinery we employ, our methods of organisation, our internal and external relationships must all be conditioned by the overriding fact that it is persons, and not statistics or papers, with which we are dealing.

I feel sure that however hard and strenuous the task which we face—and we must have no illusions on that score—we can tackle it cheerfully and with confidence if we will work together as a team, imbued both by the urgency and the high responsibility of what we are setting out to do.

It fell to our lot to stay at home while others fought for us on the battlefields of the world, on land and sea and in the air. By their courage and unflagging effort they have won for the world the freedom and liberty which was their and our goal. They have released the great forces of democracy to solve the

THE TEAM

vast problems which confront a disordered and disrupted world. It is our privilege now to play a vital part in directing and planning those new energies into the channels which will bring peace and prosperity to our people and to humanity as a whole. There could be no greater responsibility and no greater privilege than to undertake this great task, showing ourselves the worthy partners of those who have given us the opportunity.

It is in that spirit of devotion to the future of our country that I ask you to work with me and to do your best.

(B) THE RESEARCH WORKER

*The Opening of the Physical Society Exhibition
1st January, 1946.*

During the years of war we have of necessity become more self-reliant for our research and development in all branches of science and technology, upon our own native manufacturers. And judging by the outstanding results which we have achieved during the last six years there can be no doubt at all that our scientific instrument makers have served us well. Many of them have turned their efforts to the direct production of instruments for aircraft, tanks or ships of all kinds and have thus entered the field of semi-mass production or even of mass production itself, but this has not prevented them from continuing with the development and production of those many scientific instruments of extreme accuracy upon which so much of our present research and industrial technique is based.

Indeed, instead of debasing their standards by introducing volume production, they have carried into that mass production the skill and accuracy which they had long cultivated in their specialised and small-quantity productions.

In the result, the war should have put us into a position to expand our scientific instrument production upon a large scale, preserving all the excellences for which our leading firms have so justly been famed in the past.

And the present moment is a most appropriate one in which to demonstrate this fact, not merely to our own users

of these instruments, but also to the potential customers for them from all parts of the world.

As in the first world war, so in this last one, we have learnt how backward we have been in our research efforts during times of peace. Research is easily and widely recognised as the sole basis for rapid progress and superiority in war time; so much so that every effort is made by the state to entrain every scientist available in one line of research or investigation or in another. The scientist is the blue-eyed boy called in to help the solution of every problem and to force the pace of progress in a never-ending duel of wits and intelligence with the enemy.

And the scientist must be duly and properly equipped for his work. Great research establishments are improvised regardless of cost and filled with the most up-to-date instruments and machinery—which, incidentally, put to shame the accommodation and facilities of our peace-time universities and other research centres.

Nothing is regarded as wasted that may contribute to the superiority over the enemy in any field. Tens of thousands of research man-hours are gladly sacrificed to the merest chance of some new development which will give us advantage over the foe. But, as we experienced between the two wars, the atmosphere is apt to change when the crucial danger of war is past. We then weigh up the *£ s. d.* and evaluate whether this or that expenditure is worth our while. And in that calculation we tend to become shorter and shorter sighted. We are liable to forget that progress and superiority in peace are as much based upon research as they are in war. The tempo of our drive forward on the scientific front slows down and we fail to educate and train a sufficiency of highly skilled staff to maintain the intensity of our research.

That at least was the experience after the last war and it is a folly that we must at all costs avoid repeating after this war.

Research is the life-blood of our industrial progress, and industrial progress is the basis for our continuing prosperity as a great exporting nation.

To attain the degree of research activity which is essential to our future as a great inventive industrial nation, four things are required.

THE TEAM

First we must have the men and women adequately trained and in sufficient numbers. That is a matter of more and better educational facilities of all kinds and a free access to those facilities for the intelligent youth, wherever they may be and whatever kind of homes they come from.

Second, we must raise the status of our scientists. Too long they have been regarded as rather superior craftsmen, definitely inferior to the leaders of industry or the principal administrators. The Classical Tradition in education still claims a superiority which is out of date and the scientist is still looked upon by many as of a lower grade. Whether we look at the salaries they are offered or the position to which they are relegated in the hierarchy of industry or of the state service, we see that they are kept down in a position of inferiority.

I am not one of those who claim that the scientists should rule in all spheres, nor am I a believer in technocracy, but I am firmly convinced that both scientists and technicians are worthy, and have amply proved themselves worthy of a position equal to that of any other section of the community.

But until we gain the recognition of this fact by the country as a whole we shall not get the best out of our scientists, nor shall we make the headway that we should in applying the results of our research to our everyday needs.

The scientist must not be regarded as an individual to be called in to assist in an emergency when matters have got into a hopeless position—like the plumber with a burst water-pipe—rather he should be looked upon as a valuable and equal co-operator in every phase of the solution of our problems of living.

Third, we require proper accommodation and facilities for our research. It is not necessary that every research institution should be a palace with chromium plated ware, nor do I believe that string and sealing wax provide the essential setting for all that is of value in research. There is a happy mean in which men and women can do their best work, provided with the most up-to-date instruments that they require.

A good many of our research establishments to-day fall far below that mean in standard both as regards space—and adequate space is vital to good research—and as regards equipment.

DEMOCRACY ALIVE

I hope that full advantage will be taken of war-time surpluses to see that all our universities and other research establishments are fully equipped with adequate machinery and instruments. Finally, there is the all-important matter with which this exhibition is concerned. We cannot afford to be dependent upon others for the instruments necessary for our education of scientists or for the research work which they do, nor indeed for all those many testing instruments which are to-day part and parcel of every up-to-date industrial concern. It is essential that we should have and maintain in this country a pre-eminent scientific instrument manufacture, both for our own use and to help to supply those many other countries who cannot themselves afford to set up such manufactures.

I believe that if we could insist upon these four points we could lay the permanent and solid foundation of a live, active and vigorous research in our country which would enable us to keep in the van of the great industrial countries of the world.

(C) THE ARTIST AND CRAFTSMAN

*The Association of Master Craftsmen,
26th November, 1945.*

We are living in an age in which all our efforts are expended to raise the standards of the common man and woman and to make available to them, in growing quantities, the things that in earlier times were the comparative luxuries of the few.

This means that in order to lower the cost of the article and so attain a wider area of distribution we must cheapen the process of production. This we can only do—if we are to maintain or increase the general standard of living—by replacing man power by machine power.

For this reason attention is focused on the need for mass production, in which it becomes an economic proposition to expend very large capital sums upon machinery which can produce such great quantities of goods cheaply that they can amortise the capital cost of the machinery and yet be sold at a low price.

THE TEAM

I mention this general trend of our production because I believe it brings into high relief the continuing value of the work of the craftsman.

The craftsman might be defined—if capable of definition at all—as a person who has the capacity both to design an article and to execute his own design in its making. The master craftsman is one who possesses this capacity but who has many working under or with him to his directions, assisting in the carrying out of his designs.

The essence of craftsmanship so far as production is concerned is an intimate knowledge of the material worked upon gained from such work carried out personally.

It is, perhaps, doubtful whether any designer can really be successful unless he too is a craftsman. Certainly the artist, however artistic he may be, cannot design effectively unless he understands the medium in which his design is to be manufactured.

The use of simple machinery to assist the craftsman does not at all necessarily take away from the craftsmanship. I don't believe that the modern craftsman would be so meticulous in insistence upon hand work as to deny the tailor the use of a sewing-machine or the potter the use of a power-driven wheel. And yet there must be a limit past which goods become machine-made and the essential elements of craftsmanship disappear.

We may not unnaturally ask ourselves—in this modern mass-produced age—where in society the function of the craftsman is to be found.

I believe that the craftsman has two very real functions to perform, both of which are important for the maintenance of our cultural heritage.

The one thing that we all should want to avoid is to reduce our national taste to a dead level of uninspired mass production. In other words, to content ourselves with mere soundness of materials and of machine workmanship without any regard to the pleasure and convenience that we can derive from beautiful and well-designed articles.

We take trouble to display in our museums and exhibitions the beautiful things made in past generations, we are taught to admire them, but we want equally to learn to admire the

beautiful things, the convenient well-designed things made in our own age.

Craftsmanship can help us in two ways to achieve this higher cultural standard.

First, it can provide direct access, for those who are better off and can afford to pay more for an article, to a greater variety of articles of varying design than could ever be available on mass-production lines. It can give thousands of individuals the joy and satisfaction of possessing an article which contains within its form and colour some part of the craftsman's soul and spirit, something which he alone can contribute because it is his own handiwork. No copy, however perfectly machine-produced, can have that same personal connection with the craftsman, or can provide that channel for his personality to be passed on to the possessor of the article he has made.

There is, therefore, still a field in which this stimulus to our national culture can operate, and let this be noted, that, as our standard of living based upon mass production increases, so more and more individuals will be able to enjoy some measure of this sharing of the inspiration of craftsmanship.

The second and no less important function is to guide and direct the designs upon which our mass production is based.

Just as with aircraft, the first prototypes must be hand-made to the designers' pattern before they can go into production, so with every other article if it is to satisfy our desire for beauty and convenience, the prototype should be the work of the craftsman.

It is true the machines will not be able to reproduce all the subtlety of line and colour that come from the craftsman's hands, but nevertheless, the machine-produced result may not be unpleasing.

We certainly have not yet achieved this standard in our mass production, but unless we are to debase our taste and our traditions it is essential that we should maintain our standard of design in mass-produced articles, and that can only be done for us by the craftsman.

But there is another aspect of this work of the craftsman that I would like to stress.

THE TEAM

We can say of nations as of people—by their fruits ye shall know them. And those fruits are of many kinds—from the massive machinery, sound in material and workmanship, to the more delicate articles designed to please the eye or the hand.

There is nothing very peculiar or outstanding in machine-made articles produced in many countries from perhaps the same or similar machines.

It is when we see the craftsmanship of the nations that we can judge of their character and their culture. And that is another reason why our craftsmanship is so important, it tells the world what we are like and what are our solid British characteristics. Too solid some may think on occasion, but yet it is ours and it expresses our virtues as well as our vices.

I believe those virtues sufficiently exceed those vices for it to be an excellent thing that these products of our craftsmanship should be as widely sold throughout the world as possible. And this spreading, through our craftsmen's work, of tokens of British culture has the incidental advantage that it not only costs us nothing but that it adds very materially to our exports, and exports of the most profitable kind because in their price is the largest content of British brains and craft.

You may well imagine therefore, that in my capacity as head of the Board of Trade, I am most anxious that you should continue and increase in your good works in the export field.

But even were there to be no material gain, but a loss, from the efforts of British craftsmanship, I should still do my utmost to encourage it, for I believe most profoundly that it is an essential and vital part of our national life. Without it we should become dull, uninspired and static. It is a living expression of our ever-developing character as a nation and to millions of individuals it brings a sense of joy and satisfaction in a world where to-day those sensations are too often wholly absent.

(D) THE INDUSTRIAL DESIGNER

*The Society of Industrial Artists,
11th December, 1945.*

I am very glad to have this opportunity of meeting a distinguished company of British Industrial Designers, and of adding my good wishes and those of my Department for the success of your post-war programme.

It is particularly happy that this meeting should occur at a moment when the problems of our industrial reconversion and of our export trade are uppermost in all our minds.

It is unnecessary for me to remind this audience of the vitally important part which British designers played during the last six years in building up that vast array of technically superb weapons and instruments of war which helped our fighting men achieve the victories of this year. The phrase "Backroom Boys" is now a part of everyday speech and symbolises a gratifying public recognition of the key part which those small teams of hard-thinking, hard-working experts have all played in the industrial field. The public will, I am sure, expect the "Backroom Boys" of industrial design (by which I don't mean engineering design, but design in the sense of relating function and appearance) to produce goods as suitable for peace time as were the weapons the country produced for war.

I, for one, am perfectly certain that British Industrial designers can successfully meet the many challenges which now confront us, and I can assure you that the Government will give you every help and encouragement in your work.

You all of you know of the existence of the Council of Industrial Design, which was set up by the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he was at the Board of Trade, and I am sure you are gratified that its establishment symbolises the fact that industrial design, now at long last, is recognised as being at least as important as industrial science. The Council is the culmination of many years of tireless and unselfish work on the part of a few men in the cause of British design—names like Llewellyn Smith, Gorell and Pick stand out in the history of this movement—and I hope you will regard it as such and give

THE TEAM

it your support. Although it is a new body, it is built upon the pioneer work of the men I have mentioned, and of many others including many of you here to-night, and it is my sincere hope that it will provide the machinery whereby an intimate and productive working partnership may be established between the British designer and the British manufacturers.

If such a partnership is successfully established then we shall have made a vital contribution to the economic future of our country. We hear, in these days, much talk of productivity per man hour—P.M.H.—and of the urgent need for increasing our export trade. Good design, without any doubt, is of key importance in both these matters; increasing our efficiency at home and our business abroad.

The efficiency of our industries depends to a very great extent upon our combining the latest results of scientific and technical research on the part of large and small firms alike with an attractive and suitable appearance and shape. In these days, if we are to sell our goods in competition with those of other countries, when the present famine is over, the goods must be of a kind and of a design which other people will want—they must have “eye appeal.” Here the industrial designer who is on to his job can help enormously in seeing to it that the appearance and convenience of the goods in use shall be as fine as the workmanship which has fashioned them.

It is because I have great faith in the possibility of our increasing this kind of design efficiency that I have tried to arrange, where appropriate, for the “design side” to be represented on the working parties which are being set up in most of the consumer-goods industries. In each case the working parties, or design sub-committees set up by them, are reviewing the whole situation with regard to design, and I look forward to recommendations being made which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

With regard to our exports, it is regrettably but undoubtedly true, that in the past far too little attention has been given to the outward appearance of our products, and our export sales have suffered in competitive markets through lack of appeal in colour, style and design. This we can and must remedy. We have a great tradition of British design, particu-

larly in domestic articles, to which the whole world has looked up in the past, and the products of which are still keenly sought in the market. There is no reason whatever why we should not resume leadership in this as in other cultural matters. Indeed the incomparable spiritual experience of our people during the six years of war fits them peculiarly for just that type of leadership as they emerge with the battered world into more peaceful times. Beyond any doubt we as a nation possess great technical skills, but perhaps we have an even greater asset in the brains and ingenuity that we can display—as we have shown in the war time. It would be a tragic contradiction of all this if the products of our reviving civilian industries should pass out into the world markets unworthy in appearance of those who made them.

We cannot afford—as a nation—to be careless or casual in these matters. We have got to go out and get markets, and to make sales, and we must see that our products are truly competitive in every way. It is principally for this reason that the Council of Industrial Design has been set up, with full financial backing from the Government, to do what is an absolutely vital job—make our manufacturers design conscious. That is the primary task of the Council and the greater part of its work has to do with negotiations and liaison with manufacturers, trades associations and employers' federations, on behalf of the designer, in the cause of improving our industrial design. This much the Government can do, but the designs and the inspiration can only come from our industrial artists and the success of our efforts to improve design will depend upon your inventiveness and your co-operative spirit in tackling the job, in association with the producers, at factory level.

It would be useless if the Council were to carry on a vigorous programme of education and persuasion, aimed at stimulating manufacturers to employ more designers at better rates and conditions, and to take this design business more seriously, if the designers themselves fail to go at least half-way to meet the manufacturers. I say this, not because I have any doubt of *your* capacity to undertake the job in a business-like spirit and carry it out in a workmanlike fashion, but because, unfortunately, the cause of design still suffers from a residue of

Victorianism. I am afraid there are still in this world artists and would-be designers who are contemptuous of machine technology, and who behave with a curiously nineteenth century eccentricity which is too much for even the most patient and understanding manufacturer. It is a little surprising that artists like those I have just mentioned should wilfully exclude themselves from the class of men like Leonardo da Vinci, for whom engineering was a natural complement to his artistic work, or Holbein, for whom the painting of an inn sign was a no less dignified job than the painting of a portrait. Although such people are few in number, they can do a great deal of harm, and I would urge you to make it quite clear that they are not within your conception of industrial artists.

There are two ways by which this can best be done. The first you have already undertaken, and that is a scrupulous insistence upon high professional standards and professional ethics. This is certainly an important aspect of the Society of Industrial Artists' work and, speaking as a member of one of the world's best organised professions, I suggest that the Bar of England might provide you with an example of how strict codes of honour arise out of established common practice, and of how the good name of a profession depends upon the good name of every individual practitioner.

The second way, of course, is through the educational system, and it is for this reason that a large part of the work of the Council is devoted to improving the training of artists, designers and designer craftsmen. Here again I can assure you that the Government are much concerned with helping the art schools and technical colleges to raise the standards of training for industrial design.

I hope that we shall be able to work out the closest possible liaison between training in the schools and training on the job, and that the nation will be assured of a steady supply of high-grade, well-trained students who are equipped to fit into modern industrial life. The happy corollary to this should be a guarantee of a far greater number of decently paid jobs for the artists, designers and craftsmen themselves.

I need not remind you that such transformations as are needed take time, and I hope that we can count upon you

the trained and practising artists and designers, to go out of your way—however busy you are in these next few years—to help the students and apprentices who will follow you in this profession.

I have talked much about design as a business proposition, and its obvious importance in the field of export sales, but this is by no means its only importance. At home, it is only right that the people of this country should look forward to the possibility of purchasing well-made and well-designed articles at every range of price. We possess a high standard of living, and in 1939 we had gone a very long way towards providing the common man and woman with articles of everyday use at a reasonable price, but we had not gone quite far enough in providing them with objects which possessed not only fitness for purpose, but a capacity to delight.

Here is a field of endeavour for industrial artists and designers which will be immediately repaying in terms of the satisfaction of the deep human need for beauty and peace. In the crowded century of industrialisation, through which we have passed, during which our population swelled by four times, we failed to carry over into our machine production the tradition of utility, fine workmanship and beauty of our craftsmen and so we failed to make it accessible to the great mass of our people. Now we must right this grave defect. We must add to our one track—care for machine methods—another track of care for design and beauty and so stabilise our production on two tracks.

By so doing, we shall not only be giving expression to our own cultural heritage but we shall be doing good business as well, for we shall increase greatly our competitive power in all foreign markets.

Man does not live by bread alone, the things of the spirit must be added to material things to make his life complete in happiness and understanding.

It is your great privilege and task to bring into the lives of millions of your fellowmen some glimpse of that spiritual insight and appreciation which inspires your own artistic work. May your Society become strong and valiant in this great and revivifying work so sadly needed by the war-weary world of to-day.

V.

THE HOME AND THE FAMILY

(A) WOMEN AND THE HOME

The Opening of the International Housing Exhibition and Conference, Gloucester Cathedral, 28th July, 1945.

THERE IS STILL a great deal that all of us can learn about housing not only from what we see and hear of the efforts of other countries, but also as regards our own very many and diverse problems, which to-day are also so urgent and pressing.

In approaching the so-called problem of housing let us remember that we are dealing with a vast variety of human needs and desires, and also a very large range of buildings and fittings of all kinds.

When we talk of housing we are apt to think in terms of nothing but bricks and mortar, timber and concrete, and the labour that is required to put these materials into the form of a house.

But what we are really after, what we want to create in ample supply for our people, are not merely so many cubic feet of living space, but rather happy and comely homes. That means a great deal more thought and planning, more trouble of all kinds than is required merely for house-building if we are to be successful in our efforts.

It is this emphasis on *homes* rather than on *houses* that I regard as so important. In the past, we have very largely concentrated on giving shelter of some kind no matter how and where, but people have now become much more home conscious, I am glad to say, and are demanding better standards in all sorts of directions.

The home is not only the living space for the family, but

it is also the environment in which we all spend a considerable part of our life and particularly it constitutes the surroundings in which we take what leisure we can afford and in which our children are brought up.

Not only does the happiness of our children and ourselves depend upon how and where we build our homes, but these children's tastes and habits will be largely conditioned by the circumstances in which they live their early home lives.

Slums will produce only too often slum-minds and slum-habits. The war-time evacuation has taught some of us—what perhaps we did not realise before—how greatly children brought up in the teeming slums of our cities are influenced in their behaviour and their outlook by those surroundings. Nor is that influence something which only affects the habits of these youngsters while they are children. When they reach adult life and take on the full responsibilities of citizenship, their actions will be conditioned in many cases by the deep social wounds that they have suffered in their childhood days. And for these wounds, those of us who take no interest in our neighbours' home conditions are largely responsible.

So the home is a very important factor, perhaps the most vital factor, in the education of our future citizens and in developing in them the standards and ideas that we would like to see them possess.

That is why I am so very glad that this exhibition has been associated in its setting, here in the Chapter House and cloisters, and in the special service that is to be held to-morrow, with our Christian religion, and also with art, typified by the music which we are to enjoy later this afternoon.

That is not a casual association or one merely for the purpose of advertisement: it has the deepest significance, for we cannot build homes for our people without religion and art. Both must be an essential part of the environment of our children if we are to bring them up the fine Christian citizens that we hope.

There are certain special factors that I should like to stress this afternoon, which help to make a house into a real home.

First, I should like to deal with the actual appearance and the surroundings of the house itself.

In our country we have the priceless asset of a great diversity of beauty in our countryside, we do not suffer from any soul-destroying uniformity. And nothing is more important for the future of our people than that we should preserve for the generations to come that beauty amidst which we ourselves have grown up. Unconsciously we have absorbed that loveliness and it has become a part of our standards and of our whole outlook on life. We who live in the Cotswolds, perhaps the most lovely part of our whole country, have a special responsibility as, too, have those in other districts which are proud of, and delight in, a distinctive architecture. There is a grave danger that those who have been brought up and lived in our less attractive urban centres—centres which during the last century have suffered from the vandalism of the jerry-builder and the uninspired small-mindedness of the indifferent architect—will try to apply to the rural districts those poor standards which have already ruined so many of our once-charming towns. This is already happening, unfortunately, and one often sees to-day inappropriate villas alternating with badly designed bungalows in what were once most pleasant villages or small towns.

Even from the most mercenary economic point of view this is disastrous, for though it would be difficult to save some of our industrial towns from the extreme of ugliness, it is certainly possible to retain in many country towns and villages that distinctive beauty which has made them the Mecca of visitors from all over the world.

If we destroy this heritage we shall deprive ourselves of the earnings from those visitors which are such a valuable invisible export.

But that is a matter of less importance than the provision of an inspiring environment for our own people. We must avoid the deadly monotony of the wholly uninspired rows of houses of the Victorian period, but at the same time we need that decent harmony which comes of fitness for purpose and the use of materials that blend in with the natural features of the countryside.

The Cotswolds derive their peculiarly restful beauty from the grey stone buildings and roofs which so obviously grow

out of the soil upon which they are built. It would indeed be a spiritual tragedy if we were to accept the principle that we can no longer afford to decorate our hills and valleys with the lovely and unobtrusive buildings that our ancestors erected and that we ourselves have enjoyed so deeply.

Modern methods can be applied to the quarrying of stone and tiles, and we can adapt the interiors of our houses to the requirements of a modern generation. There is much more at stake in this than the mere question of building a house—the whole of our traditions, our outlook, and our future will be affected if we allow man-made ugliness to mar the natural beauties of our country.

But side by side with beauty we must have amenities too, and in our countryside we must develop a specifically rural way of life and not look upon our villages as mere dormitories for the towns where alone recreation can be had.

At one time, before the coming of the internal-combustion engine, there was a distinctive rural social life in our villages, with their feast-days, their flower-shows, their dances and their own forms of entertainment.

The sophistication of our times has made these homely entertainments out-of-date and to-day the only forms of recognised amusement seem to be the cinema, the football match and the wireless.

This is largely due to the fact that we have never really tackled the problem of rural amenities. We haven't tried to build up a new and more modern form of village social life, yet this is an essential part of the problem of providing homes for our people.

With modern children's playgrounds, swimming baths, bowling greens, tennis courts and such opportunities for outdoor amusements, it is perfectly possible to develop a real sense of social unity in a village? while a good village hall with suitable rooms for small meetings, discussion circles and lectures and a large hall for entertainments—including the travelling cinema with first-class films—will likewise provide an ample opportunity for indoor recreation. A suitably built and furnished house in such surroundings can become a real home and also a unit in a live local society.

When we turn to consider the inside of the home the keynote to all our plans should be to save the housewife from drudgery.

Fetching water in pails from a well, lack of any indoor sanitation, unsuitable and old-fashioned cooking arrangements, no proper facilities for the washing—all these things lead to an exhausted and everwrought housewife and I constantly marvel at the devotion of our women who are able to bring up their families in such difficult circumstances. When you add to these drawbacks all those irritating specialities of war-time catering and clothing it becomes apparent that some of the greatest heroes of the war have been the housewives of our country.

We must, therefore, concentrate on easing their burden, on water-supplies, cheap electricity and all those services which have been devised to lighten the labour of housework.

It isn't necessary at this period of civilisation to make the ordinary working man's wife live a life of continual and never-ending toil. It will cost us effort and materials to ease her of her over-weighty burden but it will be money and effort well spent in the cause of future generations of our people.

In fact, I regard the organised effort to free the ordinary housewife from the unnecessary drudgery of domestic affairs as an absolute corollary to granting the vote to women. It is of little use to ask women to become intelligent democrats—as we did when we gave women the vote—if, at the same time, we allow conditions to exist which make it physically impossible for them either to educate themselves in citizenship or to take part in democratic assemblies and processes.

During the war quite a lot of people have learnt for the first time what a great deal of hard work is required to be expended upon home-keeping and that will, I hope, make them all the more anxious to see that other people are spared as much of that drudgery as possible.

This improvement in facilities for house-work of all kinds, accompanied by the general and wise tendency for shorter hours of work, will mean that the ordinary man and woman will have more time to devote to enjoyment and to cultural activities of all kinds. To-day so much time is spent in the mere job of

living on the material plane, that there is little or no opportunity for most people to think of that other side of home life—its most important side—the spiritual and cultural enjoyment of human society, whether of the family, scientists or authors, artists or musicians whom we can contact through their works, or of those even deeper spiritual contacts with God.

We know *that* from our own experience—especially during war time—and we know, too, what our society misses in its character when all its energies are devoted to material objects to the loss of all spiritual inspiration.

So we want to construct our homes and their environment, not only to give the time for such higher occupations, but also to give the opportunity to enjoy them.

The B.B.C. has done a great deal to give nearly everyone in the country an opportunity to listen to music, to hear drama, and to inform themselves of matters of every kind from all over the world. It has broadened our outlook, made us more interested in our fellow human-beings—it has in fact enormously enlarged our society within our homes. But, tired and exhausted people can get little out of it. You must have the free time if you are to appreciate the opportunities that the wireless provides.

On the other hand, there are many things people would like to do but which they are prevented from doing by lack of opportunity. We must try, as a part of our housing programme, to provide a whole and complete life for the families for whom we build.

So, when you study this exhibition of housing, think of it in the broad terms of *homes* and not merely *houses*. Remember the cultural and spiritual side of life as well as the material. Books, music, pictures, religion, these things are every bit as important as convenient kitchens, electric cookers and gas-ovens. The function of the convenient appliances is only to allow more time for the enjoyment of the better things of life—they are not ends in themselves.

The aim we have before us is to bring into the lives of all the families in our land something of that ease and graciousness which has hitherto only been possible for comparatively few. We who have had the inestimable privilege of enjoying pleasant homes with the small luxuries in material possessions and in

THE HOME AND THE FAMILY

spare time that come from a more generous and secure standard of living, should do our utmost to see that, as far as it is humanly possible, that privilege should be accorded to all our people. We cannot provide them all with the independent means required to attain the standards we should wish, and so it is that we try to make provision for these things as far as possible by communal effort. As a community, we can afford to make proper and suitable provision, but let us see to it that we do it generously and with a full sense of the great contribution we can make to the beauty of our country and the happiness of our people.

Here in these precincts, built by our ancestors to the glory of God, we should feel inspired by that love of our neighbours which Christ taught us lay at the root of our religion. We cannot show that love better than by seeing that all our neighbours are provided with the opportunity to create for themselves and their families those happy Christian homes which are the surest route to realising the Kingdom of God on earth.

(B) THE FAMILY

*To the Marriage Guidance Council, Tuesday,
5th February, 1946.*

We have just passed through a period of six years during which the family ties in our country have been placed under the gravest strain, and now that the circumstances of the world are permitting some return towards more normal circumstances, people are beginning to realise how great that strain has been.

The call-up of millions of our young men and women into the armed forces and the sending of them overseas ; the movement for war production purposes of hundreds of thousands from their homes ; the destruction of the blitz, and the evacuation of families or parts of families to places of greater safety ; the stationing in Great Britain of large numbers of active and vigorous young men from other countries ; all these things have tended to submit the sensitive bonds of relationship by which marriages and the family are held together, to strains often too heavy for them to bear.

We, in this country, have always cultivated "the family life." We invented the word and the conception of "home," which is so hard to translate into many languages because of the intimate conception of the family circle which has hardly existed in some other countries. Our domestic laws are based upon a monogamous conception of life and follow the Christian principles laid down in the New Testament. Though we have punished bigamy and incest, we have never tried by legal means to prevent those irregular sexual associations which take place outside marriage or in any way to control them. Parental responsibility, too, has been fully and absolutely provided for in our laws, but we have realised that the home and family life are things of the spirit which no material laws can foster and create. At the best we may be able to prevent some of the most outrageous abuses of family life, but no law and no regulation can create a desirable human relationship. That must be left to moral power, education, spiritual inspiration, religious faith and all such non-material forces which can bring influence to bear upon the individual.

The fact that we have legislated so freely for the regulation of the material side of marriage and family life, shows the great importance attached to these relationships by the State.

But it is well to remember that all this legislation had its origin in the discipline of the Church and for many centuries the regulation of these personal relationships was the care of the Church through its special ecclesiastical courts. It is only in comparatively modern times that the State has superseded the Church in these matters.

This change was the natural sequence of the alteration in relationship between the Church and the people whereby the Church withdrew more and more from the material sphere as political power developed to take its place. But, nevertheless, the dissociation of the moral and religious aspect from the material in married life has emphasised the differences and difficulties which arise due to the impact of economic factors upon a spiritual relationship.

Money, wealth, and position, or their lack, have tended always to play a large part in family relationships.

Perhaps one of the most fertile causes of family quarrels

has been the division of inherited property, so much so that in some countries the manner of this division is laid down by law in order to obviate both the iniquities and disputes which have arisen from the free disposition of property by a testator.

The systems of dower and of marriage settlements are other illustrations of the immixture of material considerations in what is in reality primarily a matter of human relationship.

In ideal surroundings with no cares and none of the temptations of wealth and position a great many marriages would have survived in happiness, which have crashed to dissolution on economic rocks.

I have emphasised this point, this contrast between the material and spiritual side of family life because it brings out two very fundamental points as to the relationship of the family to the community as a whole.

First is the value of the family unit to the community as an element of stability and continuity and second is the influence which the community exerts upon the stability and continuity of family life.

All communities—and I am now dealing with the political aspect of community life—are built up of individuals. Within a democracy such as our own each individual is expected to play his or her part in the formulation and carrying through of these rules and regulations—which we call laws—by which the life of the community as a whole is determined.

We are therefore all of us very much concerned with the actions and reactions of all our fellow citizens. If they take a high-minded, moral view of life then our State will be inspired by such an outlook. If they have a low, selfish and mercenary outlook then the State will have the same. The attitude of the citizen will, as we know, be largely conditioned by his environment during these early and formative years in which the boy or girl grows up. Family life is the vital element of that environment. Nothing can take its place, and the most important element in the family life is the relationship between the parents, or the marriage relationship. Therefore, from the point of view of the nation, there is no possible substitute for family life as a basis for the future democracy and so the future happiness and prosperity of the country. It is the very heart and centre

of our national existence and from and through the family influences, built up in the early years of life radiate out all those wider human relationships which have their political climax in the meetings of statesmen at great international conferences.

This is of course only one facet of the jewel of the family. Those of us who have had the good fortune to live in and with thoroughly happy and united families know that from this relationship a daily inspiration can be drawn throughout our whole lives which may well not only affect our own usefulness to society, but may also become a tradition and a guide to our descendants.

It is from this angle of society as a whole that I want to emphasise particularly the value of a sound and united family to form the solid foundation upon which can be erected that pyramid of human relationships which at their different levels are decisive of how we shall conduct our lives—in happiness or misery.

The second matter which I mentioned was the reaction of the community upon the family. This divides itself into two parts, the moral and the material. We have fortunately in every democracy—and therein lies the supreme value of democracy—a moral public opinion. It may be good or bad, but whichever it is, it exists and brings its influence to bear upon every individual action. "That's not cricket" is perhaps a typical moral judgment of the British public. Some things just are not done—the public so decree and woe betide those who fly in the face of these public standards.

But those standards are very fluctuating and though it may be true to say that in many things our standards as a nation are based upon Christian ethics, we often wander far away from that base. In matters relating to sex we have tended in the past to be over-prude. We have been afraid of invading our own privacy and uncertain as to our real ideas. We have been half-ashamed of our own divinely created animal instincts and so we have tried to hide them or slur them over. At the same time when we have seen the inevitable results of our own fear of sexual knowledge we have tended sometimes to be over-tolerant of and even to idealise these results.

In this way we have made a most difficult and dangerous

THE HOME AND THE FAMILY

environment in which our young people have grown up. We have hidden the sins but at the same time widely and often attractively publicised their results.

Here is a field in which wise education and publicity can do a great deal to help towards improving the impact of the community upon family life. We can create a healthier and more knowledgeable public opinion which will assist our young people to happier married life, and to avoid some of the worst pitfalls which beset them and into which their fathers and mothers have often fallen. A great deal has been done in this direction during the last few decades and certainly to-day we can congratulate ourselves that the public outlook on these matters is much in advance of what it was fifty years ago, though there has tended to come with the increase of knowledge an over-tolerance of laxity.

The other impact of the community is on the material side. Love in a cottage is all very well provided the roof doesn't leak, the rooms are not rat-ridden and there is enough family income to keep the home going. But "love on the dole" or marriage in the slums is a different proposition. It is the duty of the community to see that as far as possible the young married couples have a fair chance in material matters. This is especially so if we expect those young married couples to have children, for there is no greater preventive to child bearing than bad conditions and insecurity as to the future.

The community, then, can help and help greatly in two ways, first by creating a sound public opinion on the marriage relationship and second, by creating the material conditions in which happy family life can exist.

But that does not mean of course, that the individuals who enter into marriage can leave the matter to other people to ensure their success.

The greater number of marriages have their origin in a wholly desirable and natural human passion. The deep instinct of racial self-preservation causes the man and woman to come together for the procreation of children; attracted by one another's physical appearance. For a short time that may well suffice to keep them together in a close bond of association, but the real and lasting basis of a happy marriage and of a

successful home is the combination of this physical attraction with a deep spiritual understanding. It is this latter which requires so much care and attention in its development through successive stages. It is only too true that marriage is not a state to be "lightly undertaken," and yet how often it is, and through what trials and tribulations the pair have to pass before—if ever—they emerge as a happy married couple.

There is no more difficult relationship in the world than that between husband and wife because of its continual intimacy. Every difficulty, every little habit or peculiarity is magnified a hundredfold when two people are day and night constant companions. More self-restraint and more control is required to make this relationship successful than in the case of any other.

Two human beings, the phasing of whose emotions will be greatly affected by their individual physical state must always try and keep in phase the one with the other. Fresh or overtired, well or ill, worried or care-free, pessimistic or optimistic, whatever their moods and feelings they must never allow a discordant note to be struck between them.

With a task of this difficulty surely some help and instruction is necessary. Those who have lived through such difficulties and overcome them, those who have marked with sorrow the breakdown of so many marriages that started off so well, can surely help the young initiates in the working out of their problems.

Still I fear it must be said that parents very largely shirk their obligations in this matter. Very many young brides and bridegrooms never get a word of spiritual advice from their parents, who are often afraid of their own ignorance or may perhaps feel in some cases that they have made such a mess of their own lives that it would hardly be decent for them to try and instruct others !

It should, of course, be part of a child's upbringing either by example or instruction to learn what is necessary to complete the spiritual union of marriage. But where, as so often, this has not been accomplished, where indeed the wrong ideas have been impressed by bad example or loose public opinion, then it is essential that there should be available to young married

THE HOME AND THE FAMILY

couples some wise guidance and helpful sympathy, if possible before they actually marry but if not then at least when they run into their almost inevitable troubles.

And it is to do this work of inestimable value to our nation that the Marriage Guidance Council has been set up. It has before it a really tremendous task, not only to meet the normal requirements of our society, but to deal with those extra strains and stresses imposed by the years of war.


There are in Great Britain to-day tens of thousands of broken homes, war casualties in every sense of the word, and unless we can nurse those families back to health we are going to lose something of great value to our society.

What are we doing about it? I hope that all of us when we come across any of these cases will do our individual utmost to help them to a better understanding and to bring them back to happiness, but we cannot seek them out nor can we do the work that is required to create a service of help to those who are suffering. We cannot individually set up spiritual clinics and hospitals, but that is what we need, and the ready response to the offer of help by the Marriage Guidance Council shows how eagerly that help is sought.

I do therefore hope that we shall all of us help to invigorate the work of the Council and to supply it with those essential resources without which it cannot carry on its work.

It is enjoying the devoted service of many whose heart is in the work and who see its possibilities and we must help them to widen their sphere of activity and to reach more and more of those who are suffering and to whom they could undoubtedly bring help.

This can be a great spiritual adventure against those forces of evil which are sapping the wholesome vitality of our family life and are undermining the happiness of our people. The size of our Divorce Lists is the magnitude of our failure as a community to help our young people to understand and appreciate the true basis of married life. Let us, therefore, for our own happiness and quietude of mind, make our contribution to this inspiring work.



VI.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

(A) SAVE THE CHILDREN

Bristol, 19th January, 1946.

IT MUST SEEM difficult to many people while we are still without so many things that we should like to have for our children in this country to turn their minds to the needs—the urgent needs—of those millions of children who are suffering as the result of the war in other countries.

Whatever we may think of their parents and their behaviour and deserts one thing is certain, that we cannot blame the events of the past six years upon the children of Europe. They at least are innocent and I am sure that none of us would desire to visit the sins of the fathers and mothers upon the children, any more than we should wish our follies and misjudgments to be punished in the sufferings of our own children.

To these innocents who have universally suffered throughout the world, our sympathy and our Christian love must be extended. However difficult it may be—and do not let us refuse to face the difficulties—we want to do our best for them to give them a fresh start in the world.

The future—that future which we hope and pray may bring happiness in the place of sorrow, peace instead of strife—is after all, largely in their hands. In these formative years of their young lives their characters will be formed, generous and large or bitter and narrow according to their surroundings and experience.

Nothing is therefore of more importance for the future of the world, for the hopes of a stable peace and a willing co-operation amongst the peoples, than the way in which those

who are now children grow up into adult citizens throughout the whole of Europe.

They will have to suffer, they are to-day suffering intensely, and nothing that we are capable of doing can wholly remove the dangers they face or the tribulations through which they will have to pass. But we can meet that long-drawn-out time of trial for them with our love and sympathy and with whatever modicum of help our generosity and self-sacrifice can provide.

I said that we must not refuse to face the facts. Those facts are indeed grim in the extreme. Six years of destruction and disorganisation of all civilian activities have left behind them an accumulation of needs and demands that cannot be met. There are world shortages in almost every basic need of the world's population. Foodstuffs even of the most elementary kind—wheat and grains—are critically short, there are not enough fats or vitamins to go round and clothing, shelter and warmth are all of them far below the urgent needs of the people. This is the sequel to a long-drawn-out war, this is the suffering that the peoples of the world have brought upon themselves by their own mad and disordered behaviour, and we have not the capacity in the world to make good here and now these great deficits, however generous we may wish to be and however much we may feel resentful at our own incapacity.

Nor, indeed, can we remedy the situation by robbing Peter to pay Paul or depriving John of his livelihood to help Hans or Gretel. We must for our own good and for the safety of our own people keep up a standard of living in this country which can maintain health and ward off disease. To do less than that would be to sacrifice our own children in the attempt to save others. This prevents us as a country doing anything heroic to raise the almost starvation standards in parts of the continent of Europe. There may be other countries where rationing has ceased and where there is still food that can be spared for the needy children of Europe. It is right that we as Christians should be prepared to make sacrifices, but we must remember our obligations to others than ourselves in the offers of sacrifice that we make.

But these inhibitions placed upon our actions by the hard facts of an unpleasant situation must not prevent us from doing

all that we can to assist the innocent victims of the world's perverted actions. While facing the facts of the world's shortage of supplies, we must not merely resign ourselves in despair to doing nothing.

It is in these circumstances that we can turn with thankfulness and relief to those who have organised the "Save the Children Fund" and to similar organisations as providing us with a way out of what otherwise might appear to be an insoluble dilemma.

The Governments of the various European countries and of the United Nations who are occupying parts of Europe are responsible for the mass feeding of the people. They are doing their best to direct to Europe the bulk of available foodstuffs that are surplus everywhere, they are attempting to cure the all-pervading lack of housing and to make available supplies of fuel and of the other necessities of a bare existence. They are indeed trying where possible to give special alleviation to the case of the children where this is practicable, but in the circumstances of to-day all that they can do leaves a great area within which volunteers from other countries can still assist.

It is within this special area of attention to the children, the sick and suffering, the homeless and orphans, the undernourished and starved, that the "Save the Children Fund" can and does operate.

This organisation was started during the last war to bring aid to the victims of that catastrophe. In those days my father was closely associated with it and did much to encourage and forward its work, and I am glad to pay this tribute to the work he and his collaborators then did. This work has been carried on ever since and now it has grown again in size and volume to cope with the even greater necessities of this post-war period.

I have the means of knowing the good work that is being done because a collaborator of mine whom many of you know in Bristol, Miss Gwen Hill, is now out in Germany working for the "Save the Children Fund."

I would like to recount to you just what it is they are doing and why it is that your help can be so valuable to them. At the present time, the Fund has ten relief teams abroad—nine in Europe and one in Malaya, distributed as follows:

DEMOCRACY ALIVE

Germany	...	1 medical team, 1 information unit, 2 general teams.
Greece	...	1 medical team, 2 general teams.
Yugoslavia	...	2 medical teams.
Malaya	...	1 medical team.

In addition to these teams, liaison officers have been appointed in Belgium, France and Germany, to maintain contact between the work in the field and headquarters.

The universality of the S.C.F. outlook is emphasised in that it has also at the present time a child welfare worker in Nigeria, and supports a similar effort in India.

Food, clothing and medical supplies have been sent to a dozen countries, as follows:—

Belgium	18 tons 8 cwt.
Czechoslovakia	18 tons 11 cwt.
Denmark	5 cwt.
France	21 tons 10 cwt. and 500 beds
Germany	6 tons 18½ cwt.
Greece	18 tons 7 cwt.
Holland	15 tons 15 cwt.
Italy	6 tons 3 cwt.
Luxembourg	13½ cwt.
Norway	1 ton 2½ cwt.
Poland	10 tons 8½ cwt.
Yugoslavia	8 tons 9½ cwt.

Amounting in all to 126 tons 14½ cwt.

The Government has now released some 4,000 tons of food supplies for the use of the voluntary societies and the S.C.F. is determined to take the greatest advantage of this concession. The Fund had the honour of being one of the first of the voluntary organisations to send food to Europe. It has kept up a continuous supply, though the amount has been limited by prevailing conditions. Now, to seize the present opportunity as fully as possible, the S.C.F. is appealing for £50,000—little enough in face of the millions of children who need help, but a sum

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

which, translated into food and the necessities of existence, will make all the difference between life and death, sickness and health, despair and hope for thousands of children.

Bristol citizens have been generous supporters of the Save the Children Fund from its earliest days. They helped in the great activities in Europe after the last war. They gave most generous support to the Fund's relief work during the Russian famine. They have consistently aided the Fund's varied activities between the two wars. Now, under the leadership of their "first" citizen, there comes this further appeal to their generosity. I hope and believe that the greatness of the present need will bring forth a worthy response.

(B) YOUTH IN THE POST-WAR WORLD,

*Albert Hall World Youth Congress,
29th October, 1945.*

This international gathering of the Youth of the world, representing as it does the active-minded young people of many countries, has a great significance at the present time.

People of all ages, classes and occupations are actively seeking a way out of the appalling problems into which civilisation has thrust itself, and it is not only right, but expedient that the young people of the world, who have many years of active life ahead of them, should try to formulate their own views as to how the future should be worked out.

Let me for a few moments put before you some of those factors which it seems to me you should bear particularly in mind in addressing yourselves to the solutions of the problems that confront us.

The most marked development of the world over the last century has been the mastery which mankind has gained over the great forces of nature. Technical and scientific development has been astoundingly rapid and indeed revolutionary. In my own young days the motor-car was still unknown, the aeroplane unthought of as a practical means of transport, and the great basic industry of agriculture was still carried on much as it had

been 2,000 years earlier. Wireless communication was in its earliest stages of scientific experimentation, radar was unthought of, and the uses of electricity were very limited. To-day we have not only perfected all these developments but we have made what is an even more revolutionary discovery in the means of attaining atomic fission and so the capacity to utilise atomic energy.

These tremendous advances in the scientific and technical field have put into the hands of mankind the power to create standards of living hitherto undreamt of but, at the same time, they have given the human race the capacity for unlimited self-destruction. We have just passed through a period of war which has shown us how great that mutual destruction can be and which has, in its final stages, forecast the suicidal perfection which we are approaching with the rapidly improving atomic bomb.

Unfortunately we have wholly failed to match this technical and scientific progress by an equal advance in the social, political, economic and moral spheres. We have shown ourselves incapable of controlling the passions and selfishness of mankind, which to-day, armed with the new knowledge of which I have spoken, has become a thousand times more dangerous than in the past.

We have fought and conquered Fascism, Nazism and Japanese imperialism which flooded like a foul wave over almost the entire globe, showing us how evil and powerful the organised and perverted selfishness of men could be. But we have not by any means as yet got under control those forces which we conquered. In one form or another that lack of moral discipline is still showing itself in many countries and amongst many groups of individuals. Political selfishness, social distinctions, economic inequalities of opportunity, all of these are still grave factors in the development of our civilisation.

It is quite idle for us to imagine that we are going to achieve the high and peaceful standards of living at which we aim, by any method of forceful policing of the world. That policing is certainly necessary at the present time and will be for many years to come, but alone it cannot accomplish our objectives.

Who will supervise the policing and lay down the all-wise policies to which the world will be constrained by this sanction of force ? Such a method can only succeed if the policies which it is to guard and enforce are the right policies.

It is no use our imagining, for instance, that with the development of the knowledge of atomic fission and its industrial uses we shall be able to eliminate from our lives the dangers of the atomic bomb. The greater the industrial application of this new power, the more insistent will be the danger of its misuse in war. That misuse we shall not be able to prevent by any method of inspection and control any more than to-day we could prevent the use of the internal-combustion engine in warfare by attempting to control its use in peace. These developments are permanent facts in our civilisation and no paper plan for their control can ever eliminate their danger.

We are then thrown back to accepting those dangers and to the realisation that if war does recur amongst the major powers in the world it will in all probability mean the complete destruction of everything we value in our civilisation. Much has been destroyed in the past six years and the world has been brutalised by its experiences, but we have seen enough of the most modern of weapons to know that any future war must be far more devastating in its results.

It becomes therefore our cardinal duty to make the boldest effort to eliminate the risk of war and that we can only do by adjusting the political, social and economic policies of our different countries to the new circumstances. We must bring them rapidly into line with the necessities arising out of the new scientific and technical achievements of humanity.

We must eliminate that competitive and acquisitive national outlook which has so often in the past led us into war. An outlook which has been described as imperialist because it marked the desire to expand regardless of the cost to others, which was inherent in empire building. But that same power pressure may be used in the social, political or economic sphere. It is not limited to the acquisition of territory, it may work equally well for the acquisition of markets or for political control over others. Such competitive power shows itself in many forms, all equally inimical to a peaceful future for the world.

The new facts of life therefore demand a completely new approach to the formulation of world policies for the future. We cannot, if we would, set back the clock of history ; we must therefore adapt our own thinking to the new times.

But this thinking needs to be severely practical. We shall not save the world by sentiment and emotion. Just as in our scientific advances, practical experimentation has been necessary and a thorough and complete knowledge of the scientific facts, before any theory, however brilliant, could be established and made the basis for advance, so in the other fields of knowledge and human development we cannot proceed merely by bright ideas or by sentiment for good, however profound.

We have to deal with the most difficult and incalculable of all materials—human nature—and to deal with it demands not less, but more, accurate knowledge than to experiment with gases or metals or electricity. The theory upon which we base our hopes is that it should be possible to get diverse groups of human beings of all sorts, sizes and descriptions, differing in every kind of way, to live together in the world in amity and concord, without the periodical eruption of war to which we have hitherto been accustomed. Unless we can, by experiment, establish the truth of that theory, which seems to run counter to all historical experience, we must, I believe, accept the inevitability of the destruction of our civilisation at no very distant date—it may well be within the lifetime of many of you who are here to-night.

It is perhaps worth while to pursue the analogy of scientific research which has been responsible for the remarkable advances in human knowledge and achievement to which I have referred. Such research is in many cases undertaken to disprove what has long been accepted as the fact, and assumed fully proved by available knowledge. The concept that the atom was the smallest indivisible nucleus of matter long held the field, only to be disproved completely by later experimenters. In such research, experiments yielding unexpected results or even negative results are not regarded as failures. They are an essential step in building up the knowledge. So in the political, social and economic fields we need not be appalled by the uncertainty of the results of our experiments, provided we enter

upon them with an inquiring scientific mind rather than with a stubborn conviction that they must prove the accuracy of our theories.

Our aim is to establish something new and not merely to prove the correctness of our past historical experience. We must believe that the reactions of groups of human beings to varying environmental conditions will themselves vary, otherwise experimentation is useless. Nor must we be disappointed if by certain economic or social changes in the organisation of those groups we do not get the result we expected. If we were to accept blindly the lessons of past experience as being necessarily applicable also to the future, then we could with some degree of certainty establish the impossibility of getting rid of war, and we might also be able to lay down the conditions under which the danger of war could be reduced in some degree.

We should, however, put ourselves in the place of the scientist who denied the impossibility of new fundamental discoveries and therefore of any great technique advances in civilisation. We know that such is a false attitude because we have ourselves, within our lifetimes, experienced its falsity. But when we are dealing with human beings, a material more complex and incalculable than any subject matter of scientific research, we must be even more flexible in our outlook. It is only the optimists who can hope to find a solution of the world's problems. The best we can do is to experiment in the direction which we consider most likely and then learn from the result of that experiment, good or bad.

After the last war one such outstanding experiment was made in the form of the League of Nations. An experiment of the greatest value, not because of its success but because of what it taught us by its failure. We are now, I hope, about to embark upon another great experiment in the United Nations Organisation. Do not let us regard this as the last hope of civilisation. It certainly will not be perfect, it assuredly will not achieve what all of us desire, but it will give us another opportunity by its positive and negative results to get farther on with the exploration of our theory. Let us remember that the possibility of proving the truth of that theory—that nations can live at peace with one another in the world—depends not upon

our direct control of material things like armaments but rather upon the power of self-control of individuals and nations. It is more a spiritual than a material problem with which we are faced.

All the great religions of the world have concentrated on this problem and have emphasised the ascendancy of the things of the spirit over material things. In their desire to stress the emphasis of the invisible things of the spirit they have strangely neglected the visible and all too pressing material conditions of life, such as wages and conditions of work, housing, health services, education and all those matters which concern us so intimately on the human side.

It is of this neglect of the practical application of their spiritual teachings that we must, I believe, attribute the failure of the Churches to exercise the influence that they might have wielded over the development of the world. That failure does not affect the profound truth that we can never achieve our desires of peace, happiness and contentment unless we introduce into all our thoughts and actions, whether domestic, national, or international, the true self-sacrificing co-operation which has been typified in the phrase "Brotherhood of Nations."

It is this high aim in our political and social development that can alone give us the true inspiration for our efforts and our experiments. There is in such a purpose that romance and that call to our personal courage and sacrifice which has throughout the ages brought out all that is best in the human race.

Victory in the peace demands of us the self-same qualities that have been shown so superbly and superlatively in winning the victory in war. The same careful planning, the same study and the same determined heroism. This is not a matter with which we can dally sentimentally in our spare time, nor is it one which can be solved by easy formulas or the shibboleths of political theory.

It demands our most concentrated attention and, above all perhaps, our willingness to spend time in study and in discussion aimed at broadening our own outlook. We must equip ourselves thoroughly to partake in these vital experiments. The future of the world will depend not upon our capacity to achieve

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

further scientific and technical advances, but upon our power to control ourselves and our peoples in a spirit of self-effacing co-operation.

It is towards that end that we must experiment upon the social, political and economic environment of human nature, so to condition it that we bring out the best in mankind and suppress the evil competitive and acquisitive instincts that have done so much damage to the world in the past.

Let us all then, young and old, embrace this inspiring opportunity for change and for experiment offered to us by a war-weary and exhausted world, determined that we will lose no chance of widening our knowledge and experience so that each of us may make the best contribution of which we are capable to the proof of our theory that it is possible for the nations of the world to live together in peace and harmony.

(C) ON INDIA

At Edinburgh, on 14th June, 1945.

To-day there has been announced in Parliament by the Secretary of State for India and published in a White Paper, a further suggested step toward the solution of the Indian difficulties. This plan was worked out during the life of the National Government at the suggestion of the Viceroy, Lord Wavell, and is one for which I accept my full share of responsibility.

I hope most earnestly that what is proposed will prove acceptable in India and will succeed in bringing a new spirit of co-operation into the relations between the British and the Indian peoples.

Ever since my visit to India in 1942, I have hoped that some way might be found towards a solution of this difficult problem, and I have done my best to help in resolving the impasse which has gradually increased in severity since the autumn of 1942.

I am particularly delighted that the Secretary of State has been able to announce the release of the members of the Congress Working Committee from detention, and I hope that all

other political detainees will quickly gain their freedom at the hands of Central and Provincial Governments in India. These releases will mark the end of one of the sad chapters of our relationship with India and will provide the opportunity for that vigorous Indian leadership which alone can solve India's problems of reconstruction.

I welcome wholeheartedly the suggestions which have been put forward in the White Paper. They may not appear to be spectacular in terms of legislation, but they are indeed far-reaching adjustments of the constitutional position.

The idea is that for the interim period during which the final new self-governing constitution for India is being worked out by the Indians, in accordance with the plan which I took to India in 1942, and which still stands in its entirety, without change or qualification, there should be constituted a Viceroy's Executive Council in which all the portfolios, including the Home and Finance departments, but excepting those of the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief, will be held by Indians and, what is more important, that those Indians will no longer merely be nominees of the British but will be chosen from prominent politicians who will be representative of large sections of Indian opinion, such as the Congress, the Moslem League, the depressed classes, the Sikhs and so forth. At the same time, there will be created a portfolio of Foreign Affairs in the hands of a representative Indian and fully accredited Ambassadors and Ministers will be appointed to represent India at any capital the Indian Government chooses. In the same way, British India will be able to nominate its own representatives to all international conferences, a factor which may be of the greatest importance in the settlement of problems arising out of the Far Eastern war. There is a further important step announced by Mr. Amery, and that is the appointment of a British High Commissioner in India to represent British interests. This will emphasise the Viceroy's position as the head of the Indian Government and will save him the embarrassment of trying to represent both sides in any economic or similar matter in dispute.

Now this will constitute a very real advance if the suggestions put forward are acceptable to the Indian leaders, because

for the first time the Central Government of India would be practically entirely composed of representative Indians; and that fact alone must bring about a complete alteration in the balance of power which has hitherto existed between British and Indians.

It is not possible in existing circumstances to make the Viceroy's Executive responsible to the Central legislature. To suggest such a course, with the existing legislature, would be to wreck all chances of success, for the great minorities would be alarmed at the prospect of a permanent racial and religious majority controlling the central government, and this would make impossible a scheme which requires the consent of majority and minorities alike.

The composition of the Viceroy's new Executive is to be worked out by him in consultation with the leaders of Indian parties and communities whom he will ask to nominate suitable persons to act on his Executive. From these nominees he will make his recommendations to the Crown for appointment. The objective is to obtain a balanced representation of the main communities including equal proportions of Moslems and caste Hindus.

It is to be hoped, and indeed we can, I am sure, anticipate, if this scheme goes through, that the Indian ministries will be formed once again in all provinces.

The British Parliament will still retain its ultimate responsibility as it must do until a new constitution is worked out. That is unavoidable, but with this present temporary constitutional change, if it is agreed to by the Indian leaders, it is quite obvious that there will be a great shift of power from the British Parliament and Government to the new Executive Council of the Viceroy which, for the first time, will be representative of the Indian peoples.

That is the really important factor in these new proposals. They do provide a marked step forward towards self-government and a much better opportunity for the fullest co-operation between Indians of all religions and parties and the British in achieving those final steps which still remain to be taken to accomplish the complete freedom of India.

I have always been convinced, and all my recent experiences

have reinforced me in that conviction, that we Britishers must make it plain beyond any possibility of doubt that our one desire is to assist our Indian friends in every way that we can to work out, with the utmost expedition, their new constitution for a free India. These proposals are, I believe, a step in that direction.

We must not have, either in our policies or in our minds, any reservation of a selfish kind as to our commercial, industrial or financial interests in India. Such things must not be allowed to stand in the way of the desired progress to self-government for a single moment. All such questions can be taken up with the new Indian Government of India when it is formed and negotiated as between equals in the comity of nations.

Our country needs to retain the friendship of India. None but the most out-of-date reactionaries could imagine that we could accomplish that end by duress and force ; the days for such an attitude—if ever they existed—have long since passed away. We can no more compel India to act towards us in a friendly and co-operative spirit than can the French force Syria or the Lebanon into friendship with themselves.

Our one hope of maintaining our trade connections with the Indian people, connections which can well be to the great advantage of both our peoples, is by assuring ourselves of their friendship.

There is, I believe, still time to maintain and strengthen that friendship, and I am certain that that is the earnest desire of the British people. Despite all our misunderstandings and difficulties, despite all that we may have done inadvisedly in the past, the Indian Leaders are still, I believe, prepared to extend to us their friendship, provided that it is as equals. It is that equal friendship that I so ardently seek and desire.

In a world where there is so much conflict, and in which the future must so greatly depend upon our capacity to arrive at a better understanding and appreciation of the views and desires of other peoples, it is of the greatest importance that we should do our utmost to preserve the friendship of the peoples of the Indian continent by an intelligent and enlightened policy of co-operation in the achievement of their freedom.

Though my mission in 1942 brought no immediate success in its train, I hope and believe that I still have many friends

in India who know that I have done my best to advance the realisation of Indian self-government. To all those friends I would most earnestly appeal for co-operation in a new joint effort of Indians and British, as equals, determined to find a way out of our difficulties.

In whatever position I may find myself after this election, I shall continue to exert all the influence I can command, in co-operation with my Indian friends, to bring about this complete self-government of India. That is my goal and for that I shall work.

This suggestion which is now put forward on the responsibility of all the major political parties in the country is not, so far as the British people are concerned, a last word. It is, I hope, another useful contribution but if, for any reason, it should fail—which I greatly hope it will not—we must try, try and try again until by the pooled common sense of the two great peoples we arrive at a just and happy solution of our problems.

With the Congress Leaders once more free after their years of embittering confinement, let us humbly trust that we may arrive at a deeper and more sincere understanding of their self-sacrificing patriotism for their country, a patriotism which has led them into years of patient suffering. For it is only if we can appreciate their motives of loyalty to the Indian people that we can expect them to understand the honest reasons for our actions which must often have seemed to them to be so mistaken and unjust.

With mutual respect and a better appreciation of the deep spiritual and national longings which the Indian Leaders represent, we may hope to collaborate with them, striving as equals each to make our fullest contribution towards the forging of a new future for one of the world's most densely populated continental areas. In this way it may be the privilege of our generation to add a new element of strength to the structure of world peace and happiness.

(D) THE COMMONWEALTH AND EMPIRE

*Teachers' Conference at Bristol,
Monday, 9th August, 1943.*

We are all of us, old and young alike, finding ourselves whether we like it or not, compelled to pay attention to post-war circumstances and conditions.

Though the war is as yet by no means over and a great deal of suffering and of tragedy still lies ahead of us, we do at least see unmistakable signs of the coming of decisive engagements, which will determine the outcome of the war and bring us that "unconditional surrender" of our enemies which we demand.

And in that consideration of the post-war world, the British Commonwealth and Empire—to use the new compendious expression—must fill a very large place. We need not either consider it merely for what it was before the war or for what it is now, but we can well turn our thoughts to what we want to make it after the war.

There is no doubt about the fact that this British Commonwealth and Empire is the most remarkable political conglomerate that the world has ever known. Not only is it remarkable, but it is, because of its apparent lack of structure and of reason, little understood both by its enemies and foreign critics and by many of our own citizens, whether they may consider themselves its supporters, its critics or merely apathetic onlookers.

There is nothing very astonishing in this lack of understanding. Geographically scarlet patches of all or any sizes are sprawled and splashed, without any logic or system, across the map of the world. They obey no apparent principle of strategic or economic unity.

Historically, this conglomerate is the outcome of widely varying forms and times of economic and, to some extent, military expansion. It would seem that the accident of circumstances has often played a decisive role.

Socially and economically, it follows no common pattern. It embraces societies and races at every stage of evolution, from the most primitive tribal unit to the most complex modern industrial community. Constitutionally, the differences are

almost as wide. Starting with our own free democracy under a constitutional monarch or the so-called republicanism of Eire, we pass through every stage of development down to the almost completely authoritarian rule of some of the smaller and more backward territories.

Great Britain, the Dominions, the almost-Dominions such as India, Burma and Ceylon, the colonies, self-governing as Malta will be after the war, partially self-governing like Bermuda or the Bahamas, Crown colonies, dependencies and, beyond these, a whole network of spheres of influence, treaties and arrangements make up this amazing organism.

Politically, its various democracies have produced no common colour of Government. Conservatives, Liberals, Labour and various forms of National Government rule and control the destinies of its parts.

Every religion in the world is practised within its confines, and within its boundaries can be found examples of every major political, social and economic problem which to-day challenges our wit and our inventiveness. Let me give you one or two examples of these. The colour problem in South-Africa, the communal problem in India, the backward races problem in Africa, the dual nationality of Canada ; all these are profound problems of personal and racial relationship which must be solved one day somehow.

This really astonishing spectacle of sprawling diversity may well have appeared to its enemies and friends alike as something incapable of withstanding the violent upheavals of the twentieth century.

These very problems which I have illustrated were playing their part in disintegrating what had appeared stable, well-constructed political units such as the Austro-Hungarian Empire. How came it about then that the British Commonwealth and Empire, with its loose and unorganised collection of territories, survived these shocks? For the most remarkable part of our history is that this almost crazy looking structure should have survived one major world war and, anyway, four years of another.

There is no doubt that the way—for a second time in a generation—the people of the Dominions and Colonies have

come forward in the support of Great Britain in the present war, has astonished the world, and indeed a great many of our own people. There must be some principle of common loyalty to something, some reason for unity—which was not apparent to the narrow vision of the Herrenvolk or to Mussolini, would-be master of the Mediterranean—which has been powerful enough to counteract all the elements of weakness in the loose commonwealth and imperial structure.

Let us remember that it was this principle of unity whatever it may be, which saved our country and the world from the deep and foul pit of Nazi domination in the years of 1940 and 1941, when the peoples of the British Commonwealth and Empire stood alone.

Whatever one's views may be upon the desirability of imperial power, or upon the defects of our own Colonial administration, this simple historical fact of the resistant power of the Commonwealth and Empire cannot be ignored.

To take one example to emphasise my point. Not very long before the war—largely as the result of Italian intrigue—Malta was deprived of her constitution and turned once again into a Crown colony. This was a very bitter blow to the Maltese, who are a proud race.

But when the war came any offer of freedom to them from the Axis had not the slightest effect. They went through trials and sufferings greater even than those of our own people, and were as loyal to our cause and as proud of that loyalty as any men in Great Britain itself.

I want if I can, in a few moments to examine this question I have posed and see whether we can give a satisfactory answer to it. My answer will only be a suggestive basis which I hope you will be able to elaborate upon during the course of your week's study.

First of all, I think that this curious conglomerate of which I have been speaking is not a geological conglomerate of dead material, but is organically alive and growing. It sprawls not because it is inanimate but because it is constantly growing in all sorts of directions.

It is, I believe, this organic life, this lack of rigidity, this power to grow and to change which is the first part of our answer.

None of the units feel that they are bound down in their place for ever. All are free to move and change, and this movement and change is not a question of some written constitution—which doesn't exist—but is a matter of day-to-day experience.

Even during the war, when change might expect to be held up, the people of the Commonwealth and Empire have seen great changes in the West Indies, and promises of immediate post-war change for Ceylon, India and Burma.

It is this constant fact of development and of progress which satisfies those who have not yet attained full nationhood that they are at least upon a path which leads in that direction.

That, as I say, I believe to be the first part of the answer.

Then, I think, comes the fact that our conception of Commonwealth and Empire is a democratic one, perhaps very imperfect in execution but soundly based in our own democratic experience. The picture which we have of the goal for all is that at which we ourselves hope to arrive. This again is not a mere theory or unattainable desire; because of the Statute of Westminster, it has been acknowledged that that goal has already been reached by the Dominions.

The general objective towards which we travel is thus one which appeals, as sound and just and as being, on the whole, the best that mankind has so far been able to devise.

It is also attainable and it has indeed been attained by territories that a little more than a century ago were colonies with practically no independence.

Next, I think, we should place the fact that we have applied—again, however, imperfectly—certain principles of freedom in our development of the Empire.

The principle of freedom of worship has been applied almost without exception and the principle of freedom of expression to a degree unknown in any authoritarian regime.

Even where it has been considered necessary, not always rightly, to suppress temporarily the freedom of expression there has still remained a liberty to criticise, which is of immense value.

I had a very direct experience of this when I went to India, where the Press exercised very freely their power to criticise both the British and the Indian Government at a very critical time.

Therefore, although from time to time there is unfortunately suppression of freedom of expression it is recognised that the norm and the desirable norm is absolute freedom within the limits of reasonable laws of libel. That is, I think, the third element of our answer and there is one more that I would add upon a similar basis.

In the British Commonwealth and Empire the rule of law is recognised as supreme. We do not acknowledge the so-called *droit administratif* by which every act done in the course of administration is, so far as the individual who does it is concerned, above the law.

Every man, woman and child, is subject to the law and generally speaking to the same laws, and our traditions, though occasionally they may be infringed by unworthy individuals, assure us of an incorruptible judiciary and one that is not controlled by the executive.

The ultimate court in colonial matters is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and I believe that its decisions—though not necessarily always right—are accepted as the best that human beings can do to attain impartial justice.

But while we follow the rule of law we make the law flexible. We avoid the rigidity of a fixed constitution, so that laws which become inconvenient can be rapidly and conveniently changed. It is this combination which is our British rule of law, which provides a degree of security without oppression.

Finally I would add the idea of common defence. We have formed a very considerable aggregation of territories of all kinds with a common defence system and common defence forces. This gives a degree of security to each unit, again not based on theory but upon actual experience of two major world wars in the last generation.

It may well be that you will discover other fundamental qualities to add to these five, but I believe that in these five you have at least the more important elements.

You will observe that in all of them I have attached importance to the element of change and growth and to the fact that all parts of the Commonwealth and Empire are constantly experiencing this growth.

That must continue if the structure is to hold together in the future.

When we find ourselves closely associated as we do to-day, and as I hope we may after the war, with three great countries like U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and China, all of vast extent and with great populations, we must think of ourselves, not in terms of Great Britain alone, but of the Commonwealth and Empire if we are to fit as a unit into this conception of World Powers.

It therefore becomes of great importance to the world that we should maintain this curious unit that we have built up over the centuries, not as a static conglomeration but as a constantly developing and dynamic growth.

What you have to consider and what we all have to consider is how we are to regulate the life of this body so as to keep it vigorous and fresh.

Clearly we must continue to develop all along the line towards our democratic goal. This does not mean merely political development.

It means social, economic and, perhaps above all, educational development. One of the great standing reproaches to our imperial policies is the overwhelming illiteracy in the colonies.

Little advance can be made, political or economic, without a very considerable degree of literacy and of general education.

No single colonial matter is in my view so important as this of the spread of education in territories for which we are responsible in our Parliament. I would certainly include India in this statement, as I am convinced that there is an enormous task still to be performed to assist India in getting ready for the self-government she has been promised after the war.

I do not intend to criticise our past colonial administration, as it is with the future that we are concerned, though we must study the past to learn its lessons.

We should regard the British Commonwealth and Empire not as a relic of a past era in our history, but as the promise of a new and powerful weapon in world progress and development.

It is a living developing organism, full of hope and promise if wisely nurtured and soundly directed.

It provides a magnificent opportunity to the youth of our own country and of the Dominions and Colonies to take part

in the great battle which we must all wage, on many widely different fronts against poverty, disease, ignorance, exploitation and all else that hinders the coming of a full freedom or prevents the richest expression of the human personality in its infinitely varied forms.

In this struggle no personal, social, class or national interests must be allowed to check us. It is upon the complete freedom from all such restraint that the effectiveness of our work depends.

In the wider sphere of world organisations our Commonwealth and Empire will have to adapt itself to new patterns of international organisation for economic development and security. And we hope that we may make some considerable contribution to these developments as a Commonwealth and Empire.

The glory of our Empire will be the speed with which we can transmute it into the Commonwealth and the strength of our Commonwealth will depend upon the wisdom and equity with which we can maintain its progress and its growth without destruction of its unity.

(E) ATOMIC POWER AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 29th September, 1945.

All our minds must to-day be full of the grave responsibilities which confront the Foreign Secretaries who are now meeting in London. They have great tasks before them and their agreement upon solutions to the problems of Europe is a most vital necessity for the future.

At the same time there is meeting another international gathering which is no whit less important and which, indeed, from the long-distance point of view, may be considered as more fundamental. That is the preparatory Commission of the United Nations Organisation, whose charter was signed at San Francisco by fifty nations. This Commission will give way, probably in December, to the first assembly of the Organ-

isation of the United Nations, and this country will have the honour of being host to this first formal gathering of the new Organisation.

We have often in the past recognised the need for such a world organisation, but behind that recognition there has often been the half-implied admission that whatever we might try to arrange we should never get rid of war. Many people thought and felt that whatever we did along the line of international agreement and co-operation we must at the same time be prepared for its failure and for a recrudescence of the politics of power backed by great armies, navies and air forces.

Undoubtedly, this uncertainty has militated against the success of schemes of international co-operation in the past and has led us all into a dual allegiance so far as methods of solving the problem of keeping the peace are concerned.

But with the coming of the atomic bomb, the whole scene has changed radically and completely.

This for two reasons. First, because the whole strategy of war and of power politics has been transferred, and secondly, because there is now no doubt whatever that a war fought out with atomic bombs would most certainly destroy civilisation. This last war has been ghastly enough in its destructive power but the ruins of Nagasaki and Hiroshima show in miniature what would happen if a war were to be carried out with the much-improved atomic bombs of future years.

I do not believe that the people of the world have yet realised to anything like the full what the atomic bomb really means for the future history of the world.

It is quite idle to imagine that it can be preserved as a secret or that its manufacture will be so difficult or costly as to prevent any major country from indulging in its use. Moreover, if, as is most probable, atomic energy is developed for industrial purposes, its use for the destructive purposes of war will be no more difficult than was the adaptation of the civil aircraft to military use.

We must therefore face the certain fact that if there is another war in ten years' time or thereafter, the atomic bomb, probably in a far more powerfully destructive form, will be available to the contestants. That means that if there is a war our civilisa-

tion will be destroyed. This, I know, was said by some before this war in connection with the growth of air power. But that was only an intensification of the same type of destruction to which we had been accustomed in earlier wars. Substantially, the same explosives were used and the same fire-raising devices, only they were carried farther and in greater quantities.

But now there is not a quantitative change but a qualitative one. A very small object carried by aircraft or rockets many hundreds or thousands of miles can destroy a city and its inhabitants. A few of them can destroy a country in a moment of time. This completely new factor in our lives must make us think out again our whole approach to the future of the world. It is not now merely the best policy to try and avoid war, it is absolutely vital and essential that we should not allow this new form of destruction to be let loose on the world.

This is an absolute first and overriding priority for every people in the world, great powers and small powers alike. War has become certain national and international suicide—there can be no victory, it must be final and disastrous defeat for all.

That is why I stressed at the outset the importance of the meetings at which the new World Organisation is being set up and why I believe that the questions of the kind usually discussed and settled at the end of former wars are of comparatively smaller importance than the one overwhelming question—How are we to prevent war in the future?

We must all get out of our minds any idea that world organisation and world co-operation are Utopian ideas which are not practical. They are indeed the only really practical ideas in the light of the existence of the atomic bomb. They provide the one practical and possible alternative to world destruction. We can, of course, take up the attitude of some of the Japanese that we would rather be annihilated than not get our own way, but I do not believe that the people of the world are prepared to commit mass hara-kiri.

What I am most anxious to persuade you of—and indeed all the people of the world—is that we must now adopt a quite different and new outlook towards what we have in the past regarded as a distant and Utopian solution of the world's problems.

World federation, or international federation or co-operation, has hitherto been looked upon as a very long-term objective. One which might be attained after decades of development and through many trials, failures and breakdowns, each of which would bring us perhaps to the brink of war or indeed into war itself.

But the atomic bomb has telescoped history and has made it impossible for us to await long years of acute danger of war, because from that war civilisation and mankind cannot survive.

We must therefore approach the problem as if we had lived through that long preparatory stage and were now confronted with the ultimate solution.

Territorial problems, economic, religious and racial problems, questions of national honour which have hitherto been resolved by force can no longer be so resolved.

It has often been said that if duelling had started by two men holding over one another's heart two efficient modern revolvers it would immediately have ceased because of the certainty of the result. It was the imperfection of the weapons used with the good chance of evading the worst consequences that led people to continue the practice. That is true of war as well: it was the chance of a tolerable victory that led to its continuance, especially in those cases where it could be alleged the national honour was at stake.

But now we have reached the stage where two countries able to launch simultaneously atomic bombs can be sure of mutual destruction, and war, like duelling, must therefore be written out of the possible ways of settling disputes in the future.

If we can once convince ourselves and others of the absolute truth of this state of affairs then perhaps we can view the present situation with some realism and hope.

What we must do then is, it seems to me, two things. First, obviate as far as in us lies the opportunities for quarrels. That may not be wholly possible, for we cannot change mass human nature any more than we can change individual human nature. We haven't yet eliminated personal quarrels amongst individuals, and it is just as difficult or more difficult to get rid of national quarrels. We must therefore contemplate that, however

good an organisation for eliminating disputes we may devise, we shall still have international disputes in the future. No one looking at the condition of the world to-day, with its widely differing stages of economic, social and political development, can doubt that there will be many occasions ahead of us that, with all we can do to obviate it, will result in serious international differences.

We must then, as a second step, devise a means whereby those differences can be settled without war—however much they may involve the national honour of countries. There can be no exception if we are to succeed in maintaining human life and civilisation in the world.

This is, I believe, a most urgent matter and one which surpasses all others in importance. We may have a few years yet in which the atomic bomb is not a common weapon in the hands of all major powers, but they will be pitifully few compared to the immense task that confronts us. During those years we must find the way by which we can settle world differences without war. I don't seek this way to put forward any suggestions as to how that might be done because my object is to stress and stress again its urgent need.

This is a matter which must be taken up by everyone and not merely by a few overworked statesmen. It is essentially a job in which the driving power must come from the common men and women all over the world. I do not doubt the willingness of statesmen, but the task is so great and so urgent that we cannot hope to get it carried through unless we have the driving power of world opinion behind it.

The argument is a simple one. War in the future means the total destruction of both sides. We must therefore at all costs avoid war. How is this to be done ?

The atomic bomb is at the same time the most disastrous, destructive, discovery ever made by mankind and the most compelling force ever set in motion to bring about a sensible and speedy solution of the age-long problem of how to avoid war.

It is the ultimate proof of the absolute need for that way of international life and of individual life which Christ preached to the world 2,000 years ago. These principles of tolerance, self-sacrifice and self-control which He taught as essential to

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ultimate salvation are now seen to be the one way by which to avoid immediate and disastrous destruction.

We must adapt them to the solution of our problem and we must devise some method by which no evil-doer can possess himself of the means of destroying those who are seeking to follow the sensible and peaceful way of life.

But do not think I am suggesting that this is an obvious or easy job. Indeed, it is precisely the reverse, but one thing is certain, that we shall never be able to tackle it at all unless we can all approach it with a full realisation of its urgency and of the consequences of our failure if we should fail.

The thing that I fear is that as the months and years pass, the story of Nagasaki and Hiroshima will fade into the background and that we shall become unconscious of this new power of destruction which will thus cease to have its compelling force upon our political actions. We shall forget it until the disastrous moment when it comes to be used again. It is only by a constant insistence upon its existence and its potentialities that we shall keep alive the urgent sense of the need for action to escape our certain fate.

The atomic bomb should hang like the sword of Damocles for ever over our heads ready to drop and strike us until such time as we have satisfied ourselves that we have found some effective means to remove its danger, while yet harnessing this new and wonderful power to the service of man.

In the case of aircraft, another of man's great achievements, we signally and wholly failed to control the power that we created. We did indeed let loose a Frankenstein monster and the results can be seen all over the world and not least in our own country.

That was bad enough, but the atomic bomb will be ten thousand times worse if we cannot prevent its use for our own destruction. That is why we must never forget this danger and why we must bring up our children with a consciousness of their duty to remove it.

